Internationalizing Higher Education in South Africa and the United States:

Policy and Practice in Global, National, and Local Perspective

Nadine Dolby

August 23, 2011

Internationalizing Higher Education in South Africa and the United States: Policy and Practice in Global, National, and Local Perspective

This article comparatively examines the micro-dynamics of the internationalization of higher education at two major research universities: one in South Africa and one in the United States. It is specifically concerned with understanding the multidimensional flows: global, national, and local (gloconal)--within which international education practices are created. Focusing on study abroad and international students, the research examines the convergences and divergences in these practices, analyzing how local, national, and global contexts both enable and constrain the possibilities for internationalization. In conclusion, the research discussed here suggests the need for new research focused on understanding the consequences of the "encounters" produced by the internationalization of higher education.

keywords: higher education, study abroad, international students, internationalization, globalization, South Africa, United States

Internationalizing Higher Education in South Africa and the United States: Policy and Practice in Global, National, and Local Perspective

In the wake of the geopolitical, cultural, and technological shifts that accelerated and coalesced in the 1990s under the mantle of "globalization," universities throughout the world faced increasing pressure to internationalize every aspect of their system: from the composition of faculty, staff, and students, to curriculum, research agendas, and service missions (Pan, 2006; Stromquist, 2007; Taylor, 2004) .In contrast to earlier paradigms of internationalization that were anchored in first the post-World War II humanitarian impulses to foster world peace and cooperation through the United Nations, and then the Cold War politics of the 1950s-1980s, the current period of internationalization is significantly shaped by the global dominance of capitalism, the rise of the audit and accountability culture, and states' retreat from funding of public services and goods, including higher education (de Wit, 2002; Marginson and Considine, 2000; Oakman, 2004; O'Meara, Melinger, and Newman, 2001). Specific manifestations of these dynamics within higher education include the pressures on universities to generate money through technology development and innovation as the line between universities and commercial endeavors disappears; the quest for global prestige and rankings; and the ascendance of market forces as a dominant component of decision-making in almost all aspects of university life (Altbach and Peterson, 2007; Bok, 2003; Gaffikin and Perry, 2009; Geiger and Sá, 2008; Greenberg, 2007; Kirp, 2003; Marginson, 2007; Marginson, 2009; Marginson and Considine, 2000; Mohrman, Ma, and Baker, 2008; Newfield, 2008; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004; Welch, Yang, and Wolhuter, 2004).

Given these similar and shared pressures, it is not surprising that in many ways, the priorities and strategies of research universities worldwide have began to show signs of becoming what Arjun Appadurai (1996) refers to as "deterritorialized." or free-floating, autonomous actors on a global stage, with no constraining roots or attachments to local or national dynamics. Kathryn Mohrman, Wanhua Ma, and David Baker (2008) reflect on this force in their study of research universities worldwide, arguing for the emergence of a global model with particular characteristics, including transcendence of the borders of the nation-state. Frank Gafkin and David Perry (2009) note similar convergences in their analysis of strategic plans at 127 U.S. research institutions. Yet, as Simon Marginson and Erlenawati Sawir (2005) argue,

> ...while tendencies to convergence are obvious, when we look more closely for difference as well as similarity we find the global transformations are not identical by time and place. Rather, they are constituted in each place by an amalgam of global, national and local factors in complex ways (p. 289).

Referring to this dynamic as "gloconal," Marginson and Rhoades (2002) argue that "the global" does not simply flow down from above and cascade over and flood "the local": instead, flows are simultaneous and multi-dimensional. Thus, there is no set and pre-determined way in which globalization is always and necessarily going to play out in unstoppable form: there is no juggernaut, but instead a set of global circumstances that constrain--but never totally strangle-the possibilities of action (Henry, Lingard, Rizvi, and Taylor, 1999). As I and (name omitted) have written in the context of youth identities under the conditions of globalization, youth create identities "not only within the conditions they encounter" but are also "agents of change and produce the new conditions for their lives" (reference omitted). Similar dynamics are in play in

the dynamics surrounding the internationalization of higher education. Additionally, the multiple paths of internationalization produce "encounters" that are unpredictable, yet are potential indexes of emergent gloconal issues/concerns/tensions.

In this article, I examine the micro-dynamics of the internationalization of higher education by comparatively analyzing aspects of the process of internationalization at two research universities: one in South Africa and one in the United States. These two institutions, referred to by pseudonyms in this article (South African Research University and Big Ten Research University), are at the forefront of internationalization efforts in their respective nations, are major research institutions in their national/continental contexts, and are concerned with similar issues. Each institution---and specific players and actors within those institutions---encounters its own, unique set of "gloconal" circumstances: the ways in which global, national, and local factors interact to produce specific practices and policies of internationalization within that context. This article is thus specifically concerned with understanding the multidimensional flows: global, national, and local--within which international education practices are created. As in Marginson and Sawir's (2006) comparative analysis of leading research universities in Indonesia and Australia, this article examines" signs and conditions of local autonomy and agency, especially the capacity for self-determined global initiatives with shaping effects " (p. 345). In contrast to Marginson and Sawir's study of university leaders, this research includes a limited number of university leaders, instead focusing attention on the mid-level offices and committees that are the location of the specific practices of internationalization on each campus.

While internationalization affects every aspect of higher education, this article concentrates on two of its most visible aspects: study abroad and international students. Both are important metrics by which universities are measured in terms of their commitment to

internationalization.[1] Additionally, both are central (though distinct) aspects of larger, conceptual frameworks and university strategic plans on internationalization (American Council on Education, 2008). Study abroad, as is well-documented, is increasingly popular among undergraduates, particularly in center nations such as the United States (Institute of International Education, 2010). At major research universities--the focus of this article---international students constitute a significant percentage of the graduate student population, and are an everyday way in which locals experience internationalization, through informal interactions. Other aspects of internationalization, for example, internationalization of curriculum, are also critical, but are largely beyond the scope of this article.[2]

The primary research questions that structure this analysis include: 1.) how do global, national, and local (glocanal) flows shape the possibilities for internationalization at the two institutions ; 2.) what specific practices resulted from this constellation of flows and 3) where and how was local agency made possible.

In the balance of this article, I first provide the larger context for the internationalization of higher education worldwide, and then focus on the specific national and local dynamics in South Africa and the United States. In the following section, I discuss the research methodology, with attention to the broader questions of the choice of institutions and the comparative analysis, and a detailed discussion of the data collection and analysis. The data and discussion that follows examines the two central institutional practices which are of concern in this essay: study abroad and international students, and the ways in which the differing "glocanal" contexts produce patterns of practices at the two institutions which both converge and diverge. The conclusion points towards the implications of this research for future studies. I suggest that the findings of

this research indicate the need for increased focus on the "encounters"(Dolby, 2004) which are outcomes of the internationalization of higher education.

Internationalization of Higher Education in Global Perspective

Internationalization is a growing concern of higher education institutions globally. Jane Knight and Hans de Wit (1997) define internationalization as "the process of integrating an international perspective into the teaching/learning, research and service functions" of a higher education institution (p. 8). A second frequently cited definition is that of Brenda Ellingboe (1998), who writes that internationalization involves, "An ongoing, future oriented, multi-dimensional, interdisciplinary, leadership-driven vision that involves many stakeholders working to change the internal dynamics of an institution to respond and adapt appropriately to an increasingly diverse, globally-focused, ever-changing external environment" (p. 199). However, as Carlton McLellan (2008) has argued, these often-referenced definitions of internationalization minimize the human agency that shapes these processes. He writes, "The process of internationalization…..occurs not on its own but as a result of policies (written or unwritten), strategies, and specific actions of an international nature" (p. 133).

As universities begin to focus on internationalization, research on the processes, policies, and practices associated with these shifts has also increased (e.g., Altbach and Peterson, 2007; Agarwal et al, 2007; Bartell, 2003; Dolby and Rahman, 2008; Huang, 2006, Ma, 2006; Marginson and Sawir, 2006; Paige 2003, Stromquist, 2007; Tabulawa, 2007; Taylor 2004). The conversations and struggles over internationalization at universities take place in the context of large-scale shifts in the higher education landscape. Marketization, liberalization, and privatization are components of this new terrain, which stresses corporate principles of accountability. In this environment, public higher education is no longer primarily a public good

which serves and is funded by the state, but is increasingly seen as a more privately-focused enterprise where state funding is diminished. Hence, there is mounting pressure on public universities to raise substantial portions of their own budgets (Deem, 2001; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004; Giroux, 2007). As a result, he growing focus on internationalization in universities occurs in a specific *global* context, in which the economic rationalization for internationalization is of generally greater concern than other rationales, for example, sociopolitical or academic. [3]

Perhaps most significantly, research universities worldwide are influenced by what Kathryn Mohrman, Wanhua Ma, and David Baker (2008) term the "Emerging Global Model" of the research university (see also Ma, 2008). This global model, while only descriptive of the top research universities in the world, creates pressure on all universities to adopt similar characteristics and practices. As scholars such as Rosemary Deem (2001) discuss, the *local* context of a particular university is often neglected in the quest to demonstrate convergence and similarity under the new forces of globalization. Such pressures are also detected in the discourse of the "world class" university (Deem, Mok, and Lucas, 2008) that focuses a university's attention on external rankings and global university league tables, at the expense of concentrating on local concerns (see Marginson, 2007 on the normative power of global rankings). However, Simon Marginson and Erlenawati Sawir (2005) argue, "to understand the global in higher education we must situate it historically in terms of local individuals and institutions in contexts, even while 'agency' and 'context' are endlessly changeable" (p. 282). Such attention to what Deem (2001) terms the "local-global" axis can provide insight into the ways in which local conditions, priorities, and constraints shape the possibilities of internationalization, and create unanticipated opportunities.

The Comparative Context of Glocanal Analysis: South Africa and the United States

In this article, I use an approach adopted from comparative education to illuminate the differing ways in which the global internationalization of higher education is unfolding in two contexts: South Africa and the United States. The "gloconal" method of analysis proposed by Marginson and Rhoades (2002) is echoed in the comparative education field by Frances Vavrus and Lesley Bartlett (2006) when they argue that, "attention to context and the local level is not optional by obligatory in order to generate trustworthy knowledge" (p. 96).

South Africa and the United States serve as the two contrasting national contexts for this analysis. With a population of 304 million in 2008, the United States is ranked 5th in the world with a GDP/PPP[4] per capita of $46,436 in 2009; South Africa, with a population of 48.7 million in 2008, was ranked 66th in the world with a GDP/PPP of $10,291 (World Bank, 2009).[5] On the Human Development Index (2010), the United States is ranked #4 (very high human development) and South Africa is ranked #110 (medium human development) of 169 countries ranked. [6] In the continental context, South Africa is the leading economic and political force in sub-Saharan Africa, with a more developed economy and infrastructure than the majority of other African countries (Human Development Index, 2010). In a world that is decidedly not "flat" in terms of economic power, it is imperative that research investigate how pressures towards convergence actually play out in glocanal contexts, so as to identify spaces of local agency, disrupt hegemonic narratives of global sameness under regimes of globalization, and to understand the unanticipated and sometimes hidden consequences of the global internationalization of higher education.

Research Questions, Design, and Methodology

This comparative case study is part of a larger, ongoing research project that examines how major research institutions in diverse national and local contexts create the policies and practices of internationalization, as they try to work within the new global dynamics of higher education. Universities on three continents (North America, Australia, and Africa) were chosen using a combination of two criteria: 1.) number of international students (using statistics from 2005, the initial year of this project), and 2.) academic ranking on the Top 500 World Universities List, as compiled by the Institute of Higher education, Shanghai Jiao Tong University. This criteria was used to ensure that selected universities were of sufficient prestige internationally that their practices would be influential worldwide, through professional networks, university associations, etc., and that they had a sufficient degree of international dynamics present on campus even without specific policies. On the African continent, I completed a case study of SARU in 2006, analyzing how this university balanced the competing demands of global and national environments, particularly in the context of the post-apartheid era (author reference omitted, 2010). On the North American continent, data at BTRU was collected in 2007. Data collection in Australia is pending.

Methodologically, the analysis presented here draws in part on Varvus and Barlett's (2006) notion of a "vertical case study." I use this methodological approach as it provides a grounding for an analysis that follows closely (though not entirely) on the "gloconal" theoretical perspective of Marginson and Rhoades (2002). As Varvus and Barlett discuss, a vertical case study, "should be grounded in a principal site....and should fully attend to the ways in which historical trends, social structures, and national and international forces shape local processes at this site" (p. 96). They further go on to note that the vertical case study "recognizes the decentering of the nation-state from its privileged position as the fundamental entity in

comparative research to one of several important units of analysis" (p. 99). However, unlike Appardurai (1996) and Marginson and Rhoades (2002), Varvus and Barlett do not specifically address the hierarchies or interactions among levels: Marginson and Rhoades' "gloconal" approach is thus also employed to specifically understand the (sometimes unanticipated) interactions among various flows, and the possibilities that exist for local agency.

Within a comparative framework (Arnove and Torres, 2003) this research asks the following questions: 1.).) how do global, national, and local (glocanal) flows shape the possibilities for internationalization at the two institutions ; 2.) what specific practices resulted from this constellation of flows and 3) where and how was local agency made possible. In this case, my research objective is to investigate how universities worldwide formulate international education policy and practice in differing national contexts. Nelly Stromquist (2007) further argues about the importance of case study,

> ….case studies provide an in-depth look into phenomena that might easily be missed when using questionnaires that cover a large number of universities but minimize the particular context and location in which they operate. Case study approaches bring to life the interrelated parts of an organization while enabling us to see the interplay between the organization and its environment (p. 85).

While it is undoubtedly true that conversations about internationalization are ongoing in many departments, faculties, and offices at SARU and BTRU, my research questions led me to focus my research and analysis at each institution on particular offices/structures. At SARU, the International Academic Programme Office (IAPO) was chosen as the major focus of this case study because it is a centralized location for the development and promulgation of international education practice and policy. Unlike many equivalent international student and/or study abroad

offices in the United States which are student service offices only, IAPO reported directly to a Deputy Vice-Chancellor, and had a significant influence in its first decade in developing the internationalization practice and policy of the university.[7] In addition, the income generated from the Semester Study Abroad program (discussed below) gave IAPO considerable stature at the university-level, as it was a steady (and growing) source of revenue during a time of uncertain state support. At BTRU, the newly formed International Advisory Committee (IAC) was the unit that was chosen to organize data collection. Considering the size and scale of BTRU as compared to SARU, it was a considerable challenge to find a way to narrow and focus the scope of the data collection, as multiple sites might be appropriate.[8] However, given the research priority of producing comparative data in two areas (study abroad and international students) that are significant both at the two institutions studied here and universities worldwide, it made sense to identify and then interview individuals who would be participating in the first structured, campus-wide policy advising committee on internationalization (The International Advisory Council, established in 2007). Further details on specific participants at both institutions are discussed below in sections on data collection.

Data Collection Procedures at SARU

I made a preliminary research visit to SARU in May 2005 to secure research permission and returned in March 2006 to collect and examine documents, observe daily operations of the office, and conducted interviews. . I examined the following categories of documents produced by IAPO from 1996-2006: reports, strategic plans, reports of activities and highlights, tactics and action matrixes, operational plans, goals and objectives, progress reports, financial reports, the draft of the internationalization policy (2001), student survey reports, the IAPO website, brochures and publicity material produced by the office, and conference papers presented by

IAPO staff analyzing their own practices and policies. I also examined documents related to SARU more broadly, including their website, mission statement, publicity materials, annual reports, documents on transformation at the university from 1996-2006, and the university's policy on internationalization, which was adopted in March 2006, shortly after the conclusion of my data collection. Finally, I interviewed all key personnel in the office (nine individuals, including the Deputy Vice-Chancellor who oversees the office) in March 2006 (see endnote for listing of titles).[9] Interviews were approximately one hour and took place in the participant's office at IAPO or in a nearby conference room. All interviews were digitally taped and transcribed. Participants agreed to be identified by their title. Through the consent process, participants were made aware that BTRU would possibly be identified by name and agreed to participate in the research with that knowledge. Titles used in the report use varying degrees of anonymity depending on participant preference. Interviews were semi-structured, and were tailored to the specific role of the individual, and their history at the office and the university. So, for example, the interview with the Founding Director of the IAPO office focused on the initial motivations and priorities of the office, while the interview with the Current Director, Internationalisation (who had only been in that position for a few months when I was there in March 2006) focused on her understanding of how the office had been positioned, and future directions. Despite these differences, all of the interviews included questions regarding: The current/past/future priorities of the office; the changes in priorities/practices/orientation from 1996-2006; perspectives on the relationship between transformation and internationalization; the positioning of SARU as a "world class" and "African" institution and what this means; the most significant challenges for the office (past/present/future); perspectives on the evolution of a

formal national policy on internationalization at SARU from 1996-2006; and perspectives on the evolution of a formal policy on internationalization in South Africa.

Data Collection Procedures at BTRU

I made a preliminary visit to BTRU in early 2007 to secure research permission. Data was collected during three separate research visits in May, July, and November of 2007. During 2007, I conducted seventeen interviews with key faculty and staff throughout the campus (see endnote for listing of titles).[10] The Associate Provost for International Affairs was interviewed twice, informally in April 2007 (handwritten notes only), and then formally (digitally recorded) in July 2007. All other participants were interviewed once, for approximately one hour. Most interviewees were members of the newly-formed International Advisory Committee, a campus-wide standing committee designed to coordinate international efforts throughout the campus and "to help inform and counsel the administration as it plans, sets policy, and navigates BTRU's course in the world in order to achieve the highest levels of success in the international arena" (Office of Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, 2008).[11] Limited snowball sampling identified several other participants, including the Dean of the College of Education. Participants were interviewed in their offices, and all interviews were digitally taped and transcribed. Participants agreed to be identified by their title. Through the consent process, participants were made aware that BTRU would possibly be identified by name and agreed to participate in the research with that knowledge. Titles used in the report use varying degrees of anonymity depending on participant preference. As it became clear during the interviews that the local (state) context and local/state public opinion were germane to the internal development (or lack of development) of practice and policy, I analyzed relevant newspaper coverage of BTRU in 2007. I specifically focused on media coverage in the Chicago

area, as parents, alumni, state legislators, and others follow BTRU news and politics through Chicago newspapers. Local newspapers in the BTRU area have minimal influence in shaping the public image of BTRU in the state. In contrast, Chicago press coverage (editorial, op-ed, news, and letters to the editor), tends to influence public debate, from the deliberations in the state legislature in Springfield to talk radio and other media. Other data collection included: analysis of public relations materials produced by BTRU in 2007 related to internationalization, including websites and promotional materials of all relevant offices at BTRU[12] analysis of the draft of the strategic plan (released in January 2006) and the final version (released March 2007). As Frank Gaffikin and David Perry (2009) assert in their study of American universities' strategic plans, these documents are "key sites of institutional discourse" (p. 138). Strategic plans are thus central to any discussion of how a university, in this case, BTRU, mediates conflicting priorities. Finally, for historical context, I spent several days in the BTRU archives in 2007, specifically examining materials and documents related to the history of internationalization on the BTRU campus.

All interviews used in this essay were transcribed and returned to participants for comment and correction if necessary. Interviews were then coded thematically and analyzed concomitantly with the themes emerging from my analysis of media coverage, university documents, strategic plans, and archival material. Following Stake (1995) I focused my analysis on what he terms "categorical data" or data that reveals patterns and "correspondence" which will answer the initial research questions (p. 77-78). Thus in this analysis, I do not focus on telling the intrinsic stories of either SARU or BTRU but on how the specific challenges facing these institutions can inform larger conversations about internationalization at universities worldwide. As Stake suggests, the patterns I found in the coding and analyzing of the data were

based on my initial research questions. However, some patterns could not be predicted and emerged inductively from the data. For example, while my initial research question led me to code for various practices surrounding internationalization, the specific focus on the two identified themes (discussed below) emerged inductively from the coding of the interview data and documents

The Context of South African Research University

Many of the global changes discussed above have had particularly severe consequences on the African continent, where universities have already suffered from decades of neglect under World Bank policies which favored investment in primary and secondary education (Olukoshi and Zeleza, 2004). However, unlike other African countries, South Africa's higher education system was large and (relatively) well-resourced, though of course under the apartheid system education was racially divided and unequal. The process of transformation began in the late 1990s under the auspices of the Higher Education Act (101) of 1997. In 2000, under the then Minister of Education, Kader Asmal, efforts were focused on merging and consolidating institutions, faculties, departments, and programs. Such efforts—not uncontested---served multiple purposes: 1.) to begin to address the history of inequality through merging (in some cases) historically privileged and unprivileged universities; 2.) to align university priorities with national priorities for training and development, so as to strengthen and grow the South African economy for global competitiveness; 3.) to streamline and consolidate costs; and 4.) to ensure that the remaining institutions were financially viable.[13] Given the overwhelming and all-consuming nature of the internal and national processes of mergers and consolidation, the majority of South African institutions had scant resources to devote to developing policies on

internationalization, even as the numbers of international students on campuses grew significantly (Jansen, McLellan, and Greene, 2007).

Yet, this growth has not been without controversy, as multiple tensions saturated international student admission policies: South Africa's commitment to the education of its own citizenry; South Africa's commitment to Southern African Development Community nations who supported the anti-apartheid struggle for decades at great cost;[14] the legacy of South Africa's relationship with the whole of the African continent; and the perception that—even in the post-apartheid era, South Africa was more interested in creating and maintaining ties with North America and Europe than with Africa. In the South African macro-political context, an early commitment to large-scale government programs and financial investment through the launch of the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) in 1994 was short-lived. By 1996, the South African government had adopted GEAR (Growth, Employment, and Redistribution) as its macro-economic policy, in line with global imperatives which emphasized privatization and redistribution of government subsidies and funding (Streak, 2004). As Molathlegi Trevor Chika Sehoole (2005) comments, "South Africa's transition to democracy in the mid 1990s took place in the context of a rapidly globalizing world that was influenced by neo-liberal policies" (p. 3). Because of this emphasis, much of the research on South African universities since 1994 has focused on the impact of global economic shifts on university practices, though without a specific focus on internationalization (Colete, 2002; Ensor, 2005; Kraak, 2000; Jansen, 2006; Nash, 2006; Ntshoe, 2004; Soudien and Corneilse, 2000).

In the last few years, research on internationalization in South African universities has grown rapidly Dunn and Nilan, 2007; Mtembu, 2004; Sehoole, 2004; Singh, 2010; Rouhani, 2007, Rouhani and Kishun, 2004; Welch, Yang, and Wolhuter, 2004). Of particular concern to

policy-focused researchers is the lack of a national policy on internationalization. Jansen, McLellan, and Greene (2007) have argued that South Africa universities are decidedly ambivalent about endorsing internationalization of higher education given the necessity of focusing on internal policies to remedy the inequities of apartheid. At the level of national policy, McLellan (2008) analyzes recent national education policy documents and argues that internationalization is implicitly, if not explicitly, discussed through a focus on the need for South Africa to complete in a knowledge society. In contrast, Roshen Kishun (2007) contends that current South African higher education policy neglects internationalization, but argues that this situation must change in order for South Africa to complete globally. Despite this growth, there is little research (with the exception of Welch, Yang and Wolhuter, 2004) that specifically examines the practices of an institution in regards to internationalization.

A historically white university, South African Research University's (SARU) process of transformation began in the 1980s, when the 1983 Universities Amendment Act allowed historically white universities such as SARU to legally admit black students. Prior to the 1980s, SARU, like other historically English universities, were technically "open" and did admit a small number of black students, but such limited admissions had almost no impact on university policy, staffing, and curriculum. Unlike many other institutions, SARU was protected from the mergers, and allowed to maintain its identity and integrity as an autonomous university.[15] However, in the period 1994-2006, SARU also underwent a contentious period of transformation, which included desegregation, consolidation and curriculum re-alignment, while being subjected to the same external pressures and concerns as other South African institutions. As Crain Soudien and Carol Corneilse (2000) discuss, the Academic Planning Framework, adopted by the SARU university senate in 1996, set the parameters for the academic

transformation of the university, including the eventual consolidation of ten faculties into six. As SARU endeavored to transform itself into a "world-class African university" it contended with pressures both internal (e.g., the development of policies on transformation, and the prolonged debate about the African studies curriculum), and external (e.g. the new National Qualifications Framework, and reduced and redefined financial support from the state).[16] At the same time, SARU faced a significantly different set of challenges compared to other South African universities, given its elite status. For example, in 2005, SARU was ranked in the 203-300 section of the Top 500 World Universities, ranked number 1 in Africa, and number 1 in South Africa. The only other African universities represented on the list were the University of Witwatersrand (301-400), the University of KwaZulu-Natal (401-500), and the University of Pretoria (also 401-500).[17] The pressure on SARU to situate itself as a 'world-class" university is also nested inside a broader range of discourses surrounding the use of "world-class" in South African society more broadly. Most significantly, the discourse of "world-class" structures the city of Johannesburg's (Egoli's) plans to transform Johannesburg into a "world-class" city in time for the 2010 World Cup (see http://www.joburg.org.za/). Such plans underscore the class tensions which are endemic in South African society at the current moment, as universities such as Cape Town, and cities such as Johannesburg strive to attract international economic investment and confidence through separating themselves from their poorer (less than "world class") neighboring nations, strengthen linkages to first world countries, and create a destination which is inviting for tourists and international visitors (see also Friedman, 2005).

Like other institutions, the dynamics of race and class at SARU are still saturated with the legacy of apartheid and the strains of a nation struggling to establish a democracy for the first time in its history. While it is beyond the scope of this essay to discuss the extensive history of

educational inequality in South Africa, it is important to stress that while the dynamics of race and class have shifted since the end of apartheid in 1994, they are still the central axes of tension and conflict in South African society. [18]

The Context of Big Ten Research University

Established in 1867 as a land-grant institution in the U.S. Midwest, Big Ten Research University (BTRU) joined other land-grant institutions in providing an education to non-elites, governed by a mission that prioritized the incorporation of research, teaching, and extension (Herren, 2002). Similar to other major research institutions in the United States, BTRU's organized, institutional efforts to internationalize the research, teaching, and service missions of the university began in the early 1960s after the passage of the National Defense Education Act. Previously, the campus had small numbers of international students and limited internationalization, primarily focused on Western Europe. [19] As the act stated, its specific objective was "to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States." Title VI of the Act provided for funds to establish "Language and Area Centers" at U.S. universities, with an emphasis on training Americans in languages spoken throughout the world which were necessary for national security but largely unavailable to U.S. students (see O'Meara, Mehlinger, and Newman, 2001 and Ruther, 2002). At BTRU, international activities were largely unorganized until the early 1960s when "the University began a coordinated series of efforts aimed at expanding and broadening its involvement in international programs." (name of university omitted, 1969, p. 3). Initial organizing efforts included a series of President's Conferences, the most significant of which was a special Faculty Conference on the Role of the [name of institution omitted] in International Affairs" held in late 1961.[20] The recommendations of the conference included:

> 1.) Instruction in non-Western languages; 2.) Area studies in addition to the current Russian and Latin-American centers; 3.) Comparative and interdisciplinary studies concerned with problems of world significance; and 4.) Introduction of non-Western subject matter by revising present relevant courses or adding new ones. (name of university omitted, 1969, p. 3).

In addition to appointing the First Director of International Programs in 1962, BTRU established an Ad Hoc Committee on International Programs, which issued a report in 1968—exactly ten years after the passage of the NDEA- entitled, **"**The Future: International Programs at [name of university omitted]." The report is reflective of the policies and practices that guided the formation of internationalization in that era. For example, the opening lines of the report state that "Until the 1960's, the primary emphasis of internationally-related instructional and research programs at the [name of university omitted] was aimed at Western Europe "(p. 3). The report goes on to indicate that internationalization efforts should specifically be focused on broadening that scope, as the four conference recommendations discussed above suggest. Such emphasis is in concurrence with the objectives of Title VI and the expressed needs of the United States to gain friends and influence in a world increasingly divided by Cold War politics. It is not surprising, in this context, that the report indicates that the University will commit resources to establishing and strengthening Area Studies Centers that focus on Asia (one East and Southeast Asia, and the other South Asia and Near East), and Africa. While the theme of "international understanding" is less prominent in the report, it was also an underpinning of internationalization in the post World War II period, as the United Nations was established (see, e.g., American Council on Education, 1956).

With the growth in Title VI area studies centers, the 1960s and 1970s were a period of significant growth and support for internationalization at BTRU. Similar to other institutions of its size and reputation, internationalization efforts were focused on engagement and development through the 1960s and 1970s, with a shift to more research-oriented internationalization from the 1980s forward. The numbers of international students continued to grow through this period. For example, in 1955/56, the BTRU enrolled 633 international students (2.8% of total enrollment). By 1968-1969, the number was 2219, or 4.6% of total enrollment. Raw numbers and percentages of enrollment continued to steadily increase: by 1992/1993, there were 3089 international students on the BTRU campus, or 8.6% of enrollment (Institute of International Education, 2005).[21] However, for the most part, internationalization remained at the margins of university life and was not a central priority. Despite regular reports from the American Council on Education promoting internationalization of higher education (e.g., Backman, 1984), universities were generally unlikely to see internationalization as a central priority.[22] Internationalization as a priority at BTRU and its peer institutions began to receive greater attention in the post Cold War era of the 1990s, and again in the fervor after the attacks of September 11, 2001.

Shifts in the landscape of higher education funding and the growing privatization of public education have also dramatically affected BTRU in recent decades. As Karen Whitney (2006) describes, privatization "is defined as the shifting of the proportion of public, state-appropriated funds to nonstate sources such as student tuition and fees, contracts for services and grant, and gifts as the principal institutional funding sources" (p. 30). Several major shifts in U.S. public policy and finance in the 1980s and 1990s precipitated these changes. The Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 revamped federal policy to allow for what is now commonly known as "technology transfer" or university ownership of patents generated from research funded with federal monies

(Geiger, 2004). Such changing conditions created the opportunity for universities to directly create wealth and fueled changing perceptions about the role of the university in society. As Derek Bok (2003) indicates, "By 2000, universities had increased the volume of their patenting more than 10-fold and were earning more than $1 billion per year in royalties and license fees" (p. 12).[23] These changes, coupled with recessions and changing state priorities, began to dramatically affect state budgets for higher education in almost all states, including the state where BTRU is located, Illinois. Edward Hines et al. (1989) noted in the late 1980s, "Over the past 20 years, Illinois' record of support to higher education can only be described as inadequate and getting worse" (p. 10). By the 1990s, as Stanley Ikenberry and Terry Hartle write (2000), "…state support for higher education fell sharply as states built prisons and increased spending on the Medicaid program. These policies priorities, coupled with an economy still pulling out of a recession, put great pressure on state budgets" (p. 5). Eric Kelderman (2009) observes that "the trend toward privatization has been widely discussed by public-college officials since at least the early 1990s, especially during nationwide recessions when state revenues have plummeted" (p. A16).

Perhaps the most significant gloconal context for BTRU in 2007 is the dramatic drop in funding from the state of Illinois from 2002-forward. As a 2006 BTRU Performance Report states, "The University has faced a harsher financial environment in this decade than in the last half century" (name of university omitted, 2006, p. 1). From 2002 to 2005, general tax appropriations from Illinois to BTRU[24] declined more than 16%, or over $130 million dollars. By fiscal year 2008, only approximately 30% of the BTRU's budget came from the state. During this period, BTRU had only managed to keep its budget relatively stable through substantial increases in tuition. From 1998 to 2007 the average tuition and fees at BTRU grew from $4374

to $9882, or from roughly just over 9% to almost 16% of the median income in Illinois (Ikenberry, Lyzell, and Kangas, 2008; see also Alexander and Layzell, 2006). Despite the decrease in actual funding from the state of Illinois to BTRU over the past four decades, as the flagship institution in the state of Illinois' public higher education system, BTRU still functions in the public imagination as created by and for the citizens of the state of Illinois. Just as critically, the increased tuition and fees students pay to attend BTRU may stimulate an increased consumer mentality among undergraduates, who have a greater financial stake in their education than previous generations (Howe and Strauss, 2007).

Study Abroad: Diverging Contexts and Perspectives

In the past two decades, the role and position of study abroad in undergraduate education--particularly in the United States context, has shifted dramatically. Before the boom of the 1990s, study abroad was, for the most part, limited to students at elite colleges, who traveled for a semester of immersion in a European language and culture (Bowen, 2001; Lewin 2009; Stearns, 2009). Little to no attention was given to the outcomes and or benefits of such travel: the focus was on the mastery of the content and history of European civilization, and the acquisition of the "high culture" of music, art, opera, dance, architecture and history that was more limited in the US context (see author reference omitted on the idea of high culture). By the 1990s, the emergent paradigm of "globalization" --which both named and created a new reality---drew increasing attention to this formerly elite and relatively rare practice. In the wake of September 11, 2001, U.S. media and government began to focus on the new demands for global knowledge, under the rubric of national security (terrorism directed at the United States, Britain, and other center nations) and economic interest (particularly perceived threats from China and India). The Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program (2005), spearheaded by

the late Senator Paul Simon, proposed federal government support to dramatically increase the number of undergraduates studying abroad. The findings of the Commission laid the foundation for a bill currently pending in Congress, the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act. While numbers of U.S. students studying abroad dipped slightly in 2008/2009 (260,327) from 2007/2008 (262,416) statistics, the overall trends show steady growth, and a doubling of the numbers of students studying abroad in the past decade (Institute of International Education, 2010). The massification and democratization of study abroad has begun to shift the profile of U.S. students who study abroad, their destinations, and the larger narrative that surrounds the purpose and desired outcomes (Lewin, 2009). New buzzwords such as "global citizenship," and "global competence" have taken over the discourse of U.S. study abroad programs (see, e.g., Lewin 2009).

In the European context, the Bologna Process, launched with the Bologna Declaration in 1999, has facilitated the mobility of students among the 47 nations that comprise the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), with a target goal of 20% student mobility by 2020. The core of the Bologna Process focuses on working towards institutional conditions to support mobility, for example, portability of loans and other financial assistance, and compatibility of degree programs. Achievement towards this target is difficult to assess, as there is little agreement on how to track incoming and outgoing numbers, and if student mobility is contained within the EHEA, or includes mobility beyond its borders (Labi, 2010). The older ERASMUS (now European Student Network, or ESN) program, established in 1987 by the European Union, has facilitated the study abroad of over two million students within the signatory nations, with close to 200,000 participating in 2008/2009. In Australia, almost 6% of undergraduates (approximately

8354) studied abroad in 2007 (Department of Education, Employment, and Workforce Relations, 2008).

Globally, study abroad is a relatively minor component of the larger trends of student mobility, which are largely concentrated on degree seeking students. Yet, from the perspective of institutional practice, study abroad plays a central role in the drive to educate students (from the U.S., Europe, Australia, and other center nations) in various aspects of global awareness. Study abroad has become particularly important at large, research institutions, as it is part of their overall public image as global institutions. While the majority of published research focuses on how institutions think about study abroad within the outbound context of their own students, this research concentrates on comparing competing realities. At SARU, study abroad is largely an inbound practice, which affects the home campus in dramatic and sometimes unexpected ways. In contrast, at BTRU, study abroad is an outbound practice---students' actual experiences and the impacts on campuses such as SARU are largely invisible, as BTRU focuses on its own students' preparation for entering a global economy and world.

SARU: Generating Revenue for Survival and Growth

As South Africa's isolation from the rest of the African continent formally ended in 1994, South African universities began to investigate the possibilities of linkages with universities throughout Africa. The first institutional internationalization program at SARU, University Science, Humanities, and Engineering Partnerships in Africa (USHEPIA), grew out of early collaborations between SARU and seven other African universities. Funded initially by the Rockefeller Foundation (and later by additional foundations, including Carnegie and Mellon), USHEPIA provides for cooperation and capacity-building in African research by funding post-graduate fellowships at SARU for staff at universities outside of South Africa, with the explicit

requirement that staff return to their home country after receiving their SARU degree. Collaborations also include visits of SARU staff to partner universities, visits of the student's home supervisor to SARU, and opportunities for cooperative research ventures. [25]

At the same time, SARU began to field inquiries from all over the world from study abroad and international offices eager to explore exchange and linkage opportunities for their students, and a trickle of American students began arriving on the SARU campus in 1996. Using funds generated from fees paid by these American students, SARU established the International Academic Programmes Office (IAPO) in March 1996. Initially, the office was charged with developing and centralizing student and staff exchanges and research agreements with institutions in other countries; meeting with foreign visitors; serving as a point of contact with international academic associations; contributing to the research culture at SARU; pursuing overseas funding; managing and developing the existing USHEPIA Programme, and maintaining databases pertinent to international academic collaboration. Shortly after the establishment of the office, it became clear that UCT also required a centralized administrative program for international students already on campus, and that was added to IAPO's responsibilities.

Yet, funding for the office was still limited, as South African universities entered an uncertain and transitional era in the immediate post-apartheid moment, As a result, the founding Director of IAPO began to investigate potential sources of income which could flow directly into the office, so that it was assured a steady fund for daily operations and expansion. As she explained,

> By the end of 1996, beginning of 1997, it became clear to me that there was a huge opportunity in study abroad for the [SARU]because we were a well-known university, in a wonderful position.[26]

Thus, in 1997, the then-Director of IAPO undertook an extensive tour of eight Australian universities. Australia, which was seen as similar to South Africa in many ways, had become a leading destination worldwide for both study abroad and international degree-seeking students, and the Director saw it as a model for the development of a professional, consumer-driven study abroad program,

> I went to Australia to find out how they did it (study abroad). My priority was to set up a business, encouraging students to come in, charge them market-related fees, and provide them with excellent service. So we had to do absolutely top class, top world-quality if we were going to do it. So building on that model, my first priority was to get an American study abroad program going. That program was self-sufficient within a year or so, and they were getting excess funds. Now with the excess funds, I was then able to get a staff member specifically dedicated to the other students, the full degree students. [27]

In 1997, the year of the Director's tour of Australian universities, SARU hosted fifty undergraduate semester study abroad students; by 1999, that number had climbed to 205 (145 from the United States), and continued to grow to 602 students (plus 71 exchange students) in 2006. In 1997, the Council on International Educational Exchange approached IAPO about setting up a permanent office for study abroad at SARU. The first Office Manager (1996-1997, now Manager, Internationalism at Home) described their incentive for partnering with CIEE,

> ….we saw this as the potential of bringing study abroad students into [SARU], and not having to provide too too much of an extra infrastructure. We could feed them all through Council. The sort of vague idea with Council at the time was that they were going to be able to provide people other than Americans: they could get students from Australia, from Europe. That didn't actually pan out. It's been almost exclusively American

> students…We came up with this formula where we would be able to fund operations within IAPO without taking money, resources, [SARU] resources, away from the vast majority of the students who were local students. [28]

Using funds generated from the (predominantly American) study abroad program, IAPO expanded its responsibility and mission steadily throughout the next ten years. By 2006, the tenth anniversary of the founding of the office, and the year that the data for this research was collected, IAPO's operations and influence had expanded significantly. From the initial three staff members in 1996, ten years later the office employed 22 staff, and served 3631 international full degree students, 602 Semester Study Abroad students (who generated R 15.7 million in revenue) and 71 exchange students.[29] The office's primary functions continued to include oversight of the USHEIPIA program, administration of Semester Study Abroad, oversight and management of international full-degree students, and coordination of SARU's collaborations and exchanges with institutions throughout the world. In addition, the office also began to take on the "Internationalization at Home" initiative, and launched an African student leadership exchange program between the University of Cape Town and the University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania. In 2006, the Director of Internationalisation (IAPO Director) reported to the Deputy Vice Chancellor for External Relations, whose portfolio included responsibility for internationalization. The office employed four managers (African Academic Links, Finance, Mobility and Links, and Internationalization at Home), and seventeen support staff.

As the Semester Study Abroad program grew in numbers through the late 1990s and early 2000s, the university, as the first IAPO Director recalled "put much more pressure on us---seeing us as a cash cow."[30] Additionally, the growing numbers and the physical presence of

largely white, female, American students on-campus began to impact the internal dynamics of the university at many levels, including finances and curriculum.

The majority of Semester Study Abroad students were enrolled in the Faculty of Humanities, fulfilling liberal arts requirements through taking courses in literature, politics, history, music, dance, and language. Thus, as the numbers of Semester Study Abroad students increased, the impact of their presence was felt disproportionably in the Faculty of Humanities; lecturers become aware of the changing dynamics in their classroom, and many began to feel that they deserved to be directly compensated for their efforts to teach international students. As the Manager, Mobility and Links Section of IAPO explained,

> The issues are very straightforward. The students are in my classroom, I need to teach them, I know they bring significant profits to the university, and I see none of it. And why should I teach these international students, who are profit engines and see no profit. It's always the same argument. Sometimes they'll throw in a bit of American students are very loud and I shouldn't have to tolerate them without anything extra in it for me or my department, and along with that would come they're needy.[31]

As lecturers and others on the SARU campus began to realize, the profits from Semester Study Abroad were significant. In 2006, Semester Study Abroad students were charged U.S. $4000 per semester, with an anticipated increase to U.S. $4600 per semester in 2007. The Manager, Mobility and Links explained that the Faculties did see profit from the students, but sometimes it did not flow directly to the lecturers who did the bulk of the teaching,

> They are getting funding, but it's a complicated mechanism, we keep our retainer, and the way that the fee income which normally reaches them is the same, and then all the profit money which is left goes to the faculty, goes to the Dean. The bulk of the students are in

> the Faculty of Humanities, which is the most cash strapped of all of the faculties, and so the Dean with a committee will sit down and allocate income according to Faculty priorities, not according to the proportion of teaching done. So yes, they're getting money as a faculty, but no, they're not getting it proportionally as a department who is doing the teaching. And that's the trouble.[32]

At the same time, it became increasingly clear that while Semester Study Abroad students were specifically deciding to attend SARU so that they could learn about Africa and African heritage, SARU was able to make spaces in those courses available because South African students were no longer choosing to enroll in those classes.[33] The Deputy Vice-Chancellor, External Relations explained the changes in the South African student population at SARU, and how those changes influenced curriculum,

> Your present day student wants to get a bachelor of commerce and go and work for a multinational. In a sense that might be rejecting African languages, but basically it's saying it was never even a possibility…what he wants to do is to get a job: the SARU diploma has a reputation that all of them get hired. A parent making strategic choices about where to put their monies would go for SARU, secure that their son or daughter will get a job.[34]

Thus, almost ten years after the launch of the Semester Study Abroad program in 1997, SARU began to grapple with a new reality, in which the study of Africa is financially and intellectually supported and promoted by the Semester Study Abroad program. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor, External Relations reflected on the unanticipated impact of the Semester Study Abroad students on the curriculum,

> So for instance [in the past], you could come to places like this, and SARU wasn't the only one, and get a degree without believing that there's an African philosophy, the philosophy would have been Kant and Hegel and Marx, and John Stuart Mills, and Thomas Hobbes. And it became clear to me and to a lot of people --it's always been clear--that curriculum is the most difficult think to change. Well lo and behold, the market is giving the lie to this, because with the advent of international students, particularly and I have to say—and this is another irony---American ones, and those from Western Europe, we are getting the revival and the sustenance of courses that were going down the tubes, because African students don't want to take those course, like African languages, and they are being ironically revived by the foreigners.[35]

With declining to non-existent enrollments of local students, the Faculty of Humanities at SARU was now dependent on enrollments of Semester Study Abroad students to remain financially viable. At the same time, questions emerged as to whether or not Semester Study Abroad students were displacing local students at the level of overall university admissions. The Manager, Mobility and Links Section, described the concerns about the impact of Semester Study Abroad students on the academic courses, departments, and faculties at the university,

> South African students are not trying to be in those classes (history, politics, African Studies). Maybe you could argue that the fact that South African students are not in those classes, then departments which should otherwise close are staying open, and thus resources that could be going elsewhere don't, and in that way, indirectly, it changes the enrollment of students.[36]

While not originally anticipated in 1996, the internationalization of SARU through the Semester Study Abroad program began to raise difficult issues about the relationship between

transformation and internationalization on the SARU campus. As the university endeavored to serve the needs of a new, post-apartheid student generation, South African students moved away from taking liberal arts courses, and became more concerned about obtaining a degree which would secure a job immediately after graduation. The growth in numbers of the Semester Study Abroad students has prevented—at least for the moment---the further consolidation and shrinkage of the Faculty of Humanities, but not without sparking troubling concerns about who on-campus is now studying and learning about South Africa, its politics, history, and culture, and to what end. Such conversations and debates are of course not unique to South Africa, as humanities (and liberal arts) education becomes increasingly marginalized on campuses across the world. While, as Cary Nelson (2003) argues, there is nothing new about economic forces bearing down on the humanities, what is new—in specific reference here to literary studies—is "a potential decoupling of the destiny of the nation-state from academic disciplines" (p. 10.). As Nelson observes, the study of the humanities has historically played an important—though of course not uncontested—role in the continuation of the nation-state. For example, national literature, poetry, and the arts are often a source of national pride and identification. But as is evident at SARU, the study of these areas has become superfluous to the academic preparation of South African undergraduates. Instead, South African literature, arts, politics, languages and history are packaged as products to be consumed by international students in a manner akin to tourism. Thus, market forces have had contradictory effects: ensuring the survival (at least short-term) of arts and humanities on the SARU campus, but also creating a reality in which South African students have little to no exposure to their own national cultures.

BTRU: A New Focus on Undergraduate Study Abroad

Similar to other comparable research universities, study abroad at BTRU has historically been regarded as a marginal component of international programs.[37] For example, "Programs of Work-Study Abroad" are a minor element of the previously discussed 1968 report on internationalization at SARU, "The Future: International Programs at [name of university omitted]". The report notes that three colleges at SARU (of fifteen colleges and divisions) offered what was termed " work and/or study abroad." Most of these programs were offered in disciplines/departments in which international experience was a critical component of the educational mission: for example, anthropological field training, archaeological research and excavation, and Western Europe art history. The only "work and/or study abroad" experiences that did not fall under this general orientation were programs in the College of Engineering that provided a very small (24 total) number of students opportunities for overseas work experiences in multiple countries in Asia, Africa, Europe, the Middle East and South America. The report also details the plans for expanded work and/or study abroad opportunities that were in the planning stages at seven colleges or divisions. Some of these plans include what was then referred to as "junior year abroad," and others involved exchanges or the development or instructional centers overseas for field/research training. Finally, the recommendations of the committee included one objective related to study abroad, "Colleges should seriously consider building an overseas study opportunity into the undergraduate curriculum for selective student use...".(p. 41, reference omitted).

Thus, study abroad existed at BTRU for many decades within the general framework suggested by the report: as an option for "selective" students, but not a requirement for all. Typical of internationalization policies and practices from the 1960s to the 1990s at large research institutions in the United States, BTRU was focused on building institutional capacity in

internationalization through the establishment of Title VI centers , USAID contracts, language training, and enhancing the ability of faculty to work in overseas sites around the world. Undergraduate competency in global matters was seen as a peripheral aspect of the overall internationalization effort, which was largely detached from the local concerns of Illinois, and more clearly articulated to the national needs of the United States during and immediately after the Cold War period.

As discussed above, by the 1990s, study abroad was quickly becoming one of the preferred mechanisms through which U.S. universities were responding to the imperative of internationalization. In 2000-2001, 1369 BTRU undergraduates studied abroad, ranking BTRU #5 in outbound students among the top 40 doctoral research institutions in the United States. By 2008/2009 (most current year for which statistics are available), BTRU sent more students abroad (1999), but its ranking dropped to #13 among the same peers nationwide. In SARU's March 2007 Campus Strategic Plan, expanded participation in study abroad is one of five initiatives under the goal of "leadership for the 21st century" and percentage of students "with a global experience" is a metric that will be used to indicate progress towards this goal. Thus, the 2007-2008 Mid-Year Report on Campus Initiatives outlines five of the project goals vis-a-vis study abroad on the BTRU campus, including (a) double study abroad participation within 5 years (b) establish a campus-wide student fee w/matching funds to support study abroad (Office of the Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, nd).

At BTRU, the effects of this clear push to dramatically increase participation in study abroad translates into a sustained emphasis on the domestic, undergraduate student. As an Associate Dean of an administrative unit explained,

> There's a lot of talk on this campus about undergraduate education. Also, keep in mind the demographics of our undergraduate population. When people talk about internationalization, they're talking about equipping our student—our typical student from somewhere in Illinois—to go out into the world and be competitive…you have a lot of interest in developing the study abroad program. Clearly the university is committed first and foremost at the undergraduate level to educating the Illinois high school student.[38]

As an Assistant Dean of a college elaborated,

> The big discussions are, how do we increase numbers? How do we increase the number of students going abroad? And there is a new call to double our numbers in the next five years. And of course many of us are nervous about that, because we don't want to compromise Illinois' standards of quality by rapidly increasing numbers without attending to impacts on quality of the experience….[39]

By 2007, the public concept of "internationalization" at BTRU had become synonymous with educating (largely domestic, Illinois) undergraduates in the global competencies they would need to function and excel in an economy that was no longer national, but global (on global competency, see Brustein 2007; Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program 2005; Hunter, White, and Godbey, 2006). An Assistant Dean in the College of Engineering, explained their perspective,

> Education-wise, in terms of our students here, our American students, a key consideration is for these students to be able to function well with people from all over the world, and be able to play a leadership role in working with engineers from all over the world.[40]

This focus on providing international experience and exposure for domestic, primarily in-state students serves numerous purposes. Perhaps most centrally, it uses the rhetoric of internationalization, while actually maintaining a key emphasis on the university's function as the flagship institution serving the state (and taxpayers) of Illinois. Such a perspective de-emphasizes the local, contextual realities of internationalization, including the presence of significant numbers of international students on the BTRU campus. By re-positioning the discourse of internationalization from an outward focus on "them" (international students) to an inward focus on "us," BTRU successfully negotiates the inherent tensions in its mandate to serve locally, while facing multiple pressures from outside the state of Illinois to reinvent itself as a global university. Secondly, it assures the state that teaching, and specifically teaching in-state undergraduates, remains the key priority of the university. A Professor and Associate Dean in the College of Medicine observed,

> Because the state legislators, in some senses, don't care about the research part of this university's function. This is the place that Illinois citizens send their kids to get degrees to get them to go on…… [41]

Such a concentration is not surprising, given BTRU's role in the state of Illinois as a flagship institution. Yet, as an Assistant Dean of a college notes, there is a sense on campus that as state support for BTRU decreases there is a need to rethink and renegotiate the historical relationship between the university and Illinois,

> We have a history, and I presume, we have a mandate to serve locally. And we are certainly serving locally by bringing in international dollars, but it's fairly well-known that some of our brightest students from Illinois leave, they don't stay here. And so, I

believe, we need to think creatively about how we're serving the state of Illinois, especially when a small percentage of our budget is coming from the state currently[42]

In a shift from earlier policies and practices from the 1960s to the 1980s in which internationalization focused on university research, teaching, and service activities that moved outward into the world, this current practice changes direction and focuses inward on undergraduates. In this current gloconal configuration of internationalization, educating local students to be able to function in a global environment becomes the anchor. Mirroring the concerns about global competition and security embodied in films such as *Two Million Minutes* (Compton, 2007), BTRU grounds its public internationalization practices in the tangible, measurable goal of increasing study abroad numbers.

International Students: Converging Contexts and Perspectives

In contrast to the still largely symbolic role of study abroad, the enrollment of students in degree programs outside their home country is growing rapidly, with at least 2.5 million students currently studying international, and current projections of up to 7 million by 2020 (Altbach, Reisberg, and Rumbley, 2009).[43] As Philip Altbach, Liz Reisberg, and Laura Rumbley note (2009), there are two major trends in international student mobility: students from Asia studying in the dominant academic systems of North America, Western Europe, and Australia, and student mobility with the European Union (p. ix). In 2008, Australia had the highest percentage of international student enrollment (20.6%), with the United States' enrollment significantly lower at 3.5% (OECD, 2010). While the United States is the preferred destination worldwide, it has not developed international education as an export industry, in the ways that, for example, Australia has (Marginson and Sawir, in press; Marginson, Hyland, Sawir, and Forbes-Mewitt,

2010). In the South African context, the number of international students has grown from just under 6,000 in 1996 (Cross and Rouhani, 2004) to 60,552 in 2007, with the majority of those (51,717) from other African countries. Data from the Higher Education Management Information System (South Africa) indicates that in 2007, students from the SADC region comprised 5% of total enrollment and 70% of all international enrollments nationwide (Council on Higher Education, 2009).

SARU: Class, International Students, and Xenophobia

Similar to the Semester Study Abroad program, the number of international full-degree students at SARU has grown significantly in the past decade. By 2006, international students enrollment at SARU (excluding study abroad), was 17%, with 12% (2586) from Southern African Development Community (SADC) countries.[44] According to SADC protocols, universities in SADC countries agree to allow at least 5% enrollment of nationals from other SADC countries at local tuition and fee rates.[45] At 12%, SARU far exceeds the base 5% requirement and questions begin to circulate about if, and how, to cap the enrollment of international full-degree students. As Jansen, McLellan and Greene (2007) ask in the national context, the question became, "Put bluntly, should the South African taxpayer subsidize foreign nationals?" (p. 5).

As the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, External Relations explained, in previous years, some Faculties—for example, the Faculty of Law (where he was an academic staff member earlier in his career), had policies in place which deliberately preferenced South African students,

> I think, with the experience at the Law Faculty and the fact that we used to do interviews, because at the time we had a preference for South African students. The students from Lesotho, Swaziland, and Zimbabwe were better performing-- at the time those countries

had a much better schooling system than South Africa had: the school leaver had better English. We had to keep those on quota, in preference for roughing it with our own from Bantu education schools because that was the mission.[46]

Yet, more recently such preferential policies have been abandoned and as the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, External Relations noted, in the Faculty of Law, "they've got a very nice profile on paper, but almost none of the black[47] students are South African, which is very scary."[48]

Tensions between South African and other African students at SARU were a constant source of concern for IAPO staff and the dynamics of xenophobia on campus are mentioned frequently in annual reports and internal memos and documents. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor, External Relations, discussed his frustrations with the xenophobia on campus,

> …it's a huge disappointment to a lot of us, who are aware that the liberation struggle was basically underwritten by poor African countries who are our neighbors, who couldn't afford it at the time, and who suffered at great odds from the South African army's incursions into their territory. But they stood fast. So to reveal our ignorance, black ignorance of other blacks from the rest of Africa is pretty disappointing, but it is a fact of life. [49]

This xenophobia, as Steven Friedman (2005) argues, is intimately related to South Africa's desire to position itself as "world class" in all endeavors, and to particularly respond to "sentiment in those countries in the North believed to harbor doubts about black competence" (p. 759).

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor continues and relates this xenophobia to a growing, internal class divide at SARU,

….it's like the city vs. country divide, with your city dwellers thinking they are sharp, and your country bumpkins, not worth much, on a continental scale. South Africans thinking that about other black, non-South Africans: that anything above the Limpopo is not worth talking about, thinking about. So you have those kids, and this thinking has led to all sorts of things. I'm pretty certain on this campus, they don't socialize with people from the DRC, with Zimbabweans, and so on, they don't date them probably.

But also, what has happened in our schooling system, and now your Model C student is here, and that student may be black, but class-wise, has nothing in common with his counterpart, not even from outside South Africa, but from Limpopo. …

…the challenge in actually housing students who have to share is being exacerbated more by class than by race now. You put two black kids in a room, but one is from a well-off, Model C kind of family, and a youth from Limpopo province, just across the room from the other bed, the other table and sees an array of laptops and the hifi equipment and I-Pods and things, and he's sitting there from a poor family, and he's happy to have just sneaked into SARU, they'll take anything they get as a job after.[50]

Such reflections echo Jansen's (2004) assertion that issues of class, not race, will be of paramount concern on South African campus in a post-apartheid, black majority state. Issues of class (and regional) divisions permeate the South African educational system at all levels—from concerns about Model C schools and the promulgation of class divides, to school fees, to the privatization of higher education (Chisholm, 2004). Rob Pattman's (2007) research on student identities at the University of Kwa-Zulu Natal underscores the growing class tensions on campuses. As he notes, black students who gathered in a particular spot on campus were called

"Model Cs," which refers specifically to their matriculation from a specific type of high school, but more generally, a class position.[51]

As the presence of the South African black middle-class grew on-campus, concerns about class were compounded by worries about the displacement of local South African students in favor of full degree international students. The issue of whether or not to actively recruit (relatively) wealthy students from poorer, less-resourced African countries was a source of ongoing tension at SARU. In the first IAPO Director's (1997) report on her visit to Australian universities, she recommended,

> Full fee-paying postgraduate diploma and degree courses should be developed for specific markets….and in areas in which the University of Cape Town has special expertise which could be of value to other countries in Africa….The post-colonial collapse of many of the top African Universities should be seen as a key opportunity for the University of Cape Town.[52]

SARU has never openly pursued such policies, and national policies made it quite difficult to secure work visas for individuals from outside South Africa. As the current Director, Internationalisation (Director of IAPO) explained, "We've always reserved spaces for students from other countries, but it's not—not---instead of. It's really, these are the applications that we have and this is what we get."[53] Yet, the anxiety over growing international student enrollments—fueled by the internal class issues-- exacerbated perceptions that SARU was more concerned over its international and "elite" reputation than with a commitment to transformation and South African national priorities. In this case, internationalization was viewed as a threat to the education and future of South Africans. As the Director, Internationalisation noted, however,

the xenophobia expressed by South Africans towards other African nationals rarely extends to the (majority white) Semester Study Abroad students,

> What has been interesting is that while the black South Africans have xenophobic feelings about black international students, they don't have similar feelings about white students….There have been radio programs, TV programs about it. Local black students relate much better with white international students than with a SADC student.[54]

Thus, according to the Director, Internationalisation, while on an institutional level concerns continued about the impact of Semester Study Abroad students on the Faculty of Humanities, interpersonal tensions between South African students and Semester Study Abroad students were minimal. However, as the Manager, Mobility and Links Section, observed, there were concerns on campus about the services IAPO provides for Semester Study Abroad students, though not for full-degree international students,

> You've had heard the thing about the amounts we spend on orientation (for study abroad students), and how that's not fair, and how we're not providing the same provision of housing (for full degree international students), and there's no housing because it's all for study abroad. [55]

As SARU tried to balance the formal policy goal of transformation with the growing internationalization of the campus, international full-degree students were caught in the midst of competing priorities. Unlike Semester Study Abroad students, most (those from SADC countries) brought in no extra revenue to the university, and thus enjoyed none of the extra support services afforded to Semester Study Abroad students, such as guaranteed and pre-arranged housing, or an elaborate orientation including a tour of the Cape Peninsula. At the same time, these (largely African) full-degree students were viewed with suspicion by the local South

African students, who often perceived them as taking places at SARU which rightly belong to their friends and high school classmates. (see McLellan, 2009, for similar and related findings), Such pressures were exacerbated by internal class dynamics, as SARU's local black students enrollment is largely from upper middle class and wealthy families. These everyday issues of SARU's student enrollment are intimately related to larger policy concerns about the relationship of SARU to the rest of Africa and the world. While Mel Dunn and Pam Nilan (2007) state that "we cautiously endorsee the internationalization of South African higher education as a means of generating domestic revenue for a cash-strapped economy" (p. 269), they acknowledge there is little consensus on this point in South Africa. Clearly, the tensions at SARU regarding study abroad students and international full-degree students are overlaid with extensive local dynamics regarding the processes of transformation, and considerable skepticism about pursuing purely profit-oriented policies (see Dunn and Nilan, 2007). [56]

BTRU: Local Politics, Protectionism, and Xenophobia

In January 2006, BTRU released the first version of its five year strategic plan. Buried in the 96 page document were three goals that when combined created an uproar in the Chicago press and the state legislature. The first goal was to reduce the number of incoming freshman by 1000, from 7500 to 6500 (name of institution omitted, 2006a, p. 47).[57] Sixteen pages later, the most controversial part of the plan included the following goal: "Increase the number of international undergraduate students." (name of institution omitted, 2006a, p. 63). The goal was modest: increasing international undergraduates in the freshman class from the current 300 to 500. Included in the strategic plan was a proposed $100, 000 to pay for additional international recruitment. While the vast majority of international graduate students come to BTRU (as to other U.S. campuses) with funding from their home country, a fellowship, or a teaching and/or

research assistantship, international undergraduate students are generally full-fee paying and thus can generate considerable revenue for an institution. International graduate students may be an indirect source of revenue generation for the institution as underpaid labor in classrooms and laboratories (Bousquet, 2008; Nelson, 1997). In contrast, international undergraduates are a direct source of revenue generation, paying between $22,000 to over $26,000 year in tuition alone in academic year 2007-2008. Though not without controversy, Australian universities, for example, have dramatically increased the number of international students on their campuses (primarily from Asian nations), in part to off-set steep declines in Australian government funding which started in the 1990s (see Marginson and Considine, 2000). The details of the proposed changes at BTRU were publicized in Chicago newspapers in the spring of 2006. For example, Chuck Goudie (2006), a reporter for ABC News in Chicago and a columnist for the Chicago suburbs' *Daily Herald*, wrote,

> Seemingly qualified high school seniors from Lake County to Lincoln County and from Moline to Monee will be denied access to the premier public university in their home state as [name of institution omitted] puts an emphasis on broadening its base of freshman foreign students (p. 15)

Goudie's column was laden with racism and xenophobia, as he pinpointed the home countries of the students,

> There is an Indian dilemma at the [name of institution omitted] and it has nothing to do with the school's mascot dancing around in war paint and a headdress.[58]

> The quandary I am talking about concerns an increasing number of students admitted to [name of institution omitted] from New Delhi, Mumbai, and Calcutta in India.

> But not just from there. Also from Seoul and Pusan in South Korea; Beijing, Shanghai, and Tianjin in China, and hundreds of other nations around the world.
>
> (2006, p. 15)

Goudie adds later that diversity can be a good thing, but not if it "gets in the way of qualified Illinois students attending Illinois' leading, tax-payer supported public university." (p. 15). Reaction from Illinois residents and BTRU alumni was swift and furious. Goudie published excerpts from some of the responses he received

> As an educator, I am very disappointed that many of the best and brightest in the state of Illinois will be unable to attend the [name of institution omitted], because he (Chancellor Richard Herman) feels that the U of I should be educator of the world, rather than taking care of our own 'home grown talent. –Chris Grachek, Lindenhurst (Goudie, 2006, p. 17)
>
> It is inexcusable that they are accepting our tax money, but not accepting our well-qualified, top Illinois students. –Nancy Thompson, St. Charles (Goudie, 2006, p. 17).

Perhaps making the situation worse, the BTRU Board Chairman Lawrence Eppley reportedly suggested to families whose children had been wait-listed or rejected at the BTRU campus to "consider as alternatives the University of Illinois at Chicago and the University of Illinois at Springfield" (Goudie, 2006, p.17).[59] Though part of the University of Illinois system, neither UIC or UIS is the flagship campus and both are typically ranked much lower than BTRU in, for example, *US News and World Report* tables. Parents, such as Linda Mankivsky Ziemann of Naperville, wrote that,

> There is something wrong when a 4.1 GPA, all-conference academic football/track athlete all-state band honor student, who worked his butt off taking challenging courses

and maintaining an excellent GPA can't get into the program of his choice at the alma mater of both of his parents. (Goudie, 2006, p. 17).

While the original Strategic Plan included plans to increase out-of-state domestic and international enrollment. comments such as Chris Gracheck's that BTRU wants to be "educator of the world" suggest that the proposed increase in international undergraduates was more controversial. Another respondent to Chuck Goudie's column, Caryn Zjeka of Buffalo Grove, reflected a similar sentiment, "I am all for diversity but when 25 percent of the U of I student population will be 'internationals' at the expense of our residents, diversity has become discrimination" (Goudie, 2006, p. 17). While certainly Zjeka greatly exaggerates (or is misinformed about) the proposed increased the international student population, the underlying xenophobic concern about "internationals" taking over a state-funded institution are well articulated.

Of course, less publicly discussed is the high percentage of international graduate students at BTRU. As an Associate Dean of an administrative unit explained,

> There are departments in engineering on this campus where 75% of the students are from other countries: that's not widely known. I don't know how that plays—particularly across the state—when they realize the high number of international students who are here as graduate students.[60]

A Professor and Associate Dean in the College of Medicine noted that the number of international students is only discussed when "it's the appropriate audience. "[61] (interview, May 13, 2007).

Encountering entrenched opposition and a state legislature poised to consider calling for hearings on the pros and cons of the policy, BTRU abruptly reversed course as Rosalind Rossi

reported, "Faced with a buzzsaw of opposition---some of it from lawmakers---[name of university omitted] officials said Monday they were ashcanning a proposal to expand out-of-state enrollment at the Urbana-Champaign campus" (2006, np). In this instance BTRU's approach to the practice of internationalization was significantly different from that discussed in the previous section. While attempts to "internationalize" through focusing on undergraduate education are welcomed, efforts to "internationalize" through actually increasing the number of international students were met with considerable resistance.. Given the intense public reaction to a plan to increase the undergraduate international student enrollment by a mere 200 students, it is clear why-- within the state of Illinois-- BTRU does not deliberately publicize the large number of international graduate students enrolled on campus. In academic year 2007/2008, 5933 international students were enrolled at BTRU, or slightly over 14% of the student population (Institute of International Education, 2008). At the graduate level in 2007, 34.5%--more than one-third, of students were international (International Student and Scholar Services, BTRU, 2007).[62] Instead the numbers of international students are used in the contexts in which they are valued—such as for rankings and international prestige. In contrast, actual international students experience marginalization on campus and within the public image of BTRU in the state of Illinois. As an Associate Dean of a college observed,

> We have a large population of international students, international alumni, and many visiting scholars. The university would benefit from creating opportunities for international education with the people who are right here. Sometimes it seems as though these visitors are invisible….[63]

Increased visibility of international students, however, would ultimately lead to more extensive scrutiny of BTRU's commitment to educating the children of Illinois residents and

serving the state. Despite the need for revenue generation through full fee-paying international students, BTRU responded to pressure from the public and the Illinois legislature and dropped its plan to increase the number of international undergraduates on-campus in the final version of the strategic plan (released March 2007). As a result the development of a specific practice of internationalization which emphasizes the role and importance of international students is not pursued in favor of safer and more publicly accepted practices that focus on the education of in-state undergraduates. Such ambivalence about international students is not limited to BTRU: these convergences will be discussed below

Discussion: Convergence, Divergence, and the Public Sphere

Much of the existing research on study abroad and international students examines the impacts and outcomes of these practices through a lens that privileges individualistic dynamics and benefits. Consistent with societal trends that position education as a private, not public good these research study focus on the good that accrues to the consumer of these services: e.g., the American student who gains language competency, and resume lines from studying abroad, or the African student who gains the prestige of a degree from SARU in her/his national context, along with the global mobility and status made possible by a respected international degree. Less discussed or studied are the ways in which the encounters made possible through the internationalization of higher education have a public component, and have an effect on the public gloconal sphere---shifting the very landscape of local, national, and global communities.

Study abroad is often posited as a singular practice, and the conversations that swirl around it are generally focused on the various strengths and weaknesses of different models, for example semester-long independent versus faculty -led short term programs. These conversations tend to be assumed under a larger rubric that assumes that study abroad is always

beneficial, and is an important node in the development of global competence for undergraduates from center nations. Certainly this perspective is encapsulated at BTRU, where study abroad is expanding rapidly. For institutions such as BTRU, study abroad serves multiple ends: it contributes substantially to the university's mission to internationalize, while allowing it to still project an image of a university that is focused on educating the children of state citizens, and growing the state economy through generating international business: all practices that are consistent with its land-grant mission, and its role (increasingly symbolic) as the flagship institution in the state of Illinois. Focusing discourses on the benefits that accrue to individual students and Illinois employers shifts the emphasis of study abroad to a private one, with any public good subsumed within discourses of individual economic security, and the need to grow the state economy within the reality of global economic competition. Conversations about where students should go for study abroad are similarly shaped by individual, private, and economic concerns: what countries/cities/regions are safe, where is English (or the desired target language) spoken, where are the places that students can benefit from in terms of career preparation, where is additional travel possible, what constitutes a good destination for friends/family who hope to visit the student who is studying abroad. In contrast, conversations about the public and private dimensions of the "encounter" component of study abroad are largely missing from the conversation at BTRU. There is little acknowledgement of the private gains for a student in the realm of cultural, social, and political awareness, except within the discourse of employment and career concerns. Within the exception of service-learning study abroad programs, there is no discussion of the potential effects of study abroad students on the communities where they will study, and how the dynamics of large number of Americans abroad concentrated in various institutions may have unanticipated outcomes (see Coffman and Brenna, 2003, for one

exception). Despite the national and international prestige and ranking of BTRU, there is little sense from anyone whom I interviewed that any substantial change in focus or direction is possible---BTRU is locked in by its gloconal location vis-a-vis its approach to internationalization and study abroad.

Almost 9000 miles and half a world away, the dynamics of study abroad look very different, yet they cannot be separated from the realities of BTRU. As BTRU attempts to push its students *out* to study abroad to fulfill its structural mandate for global competence for global competition, SARU becomes a prime destination for students from BTRU and similar institutions. SARU works diligently to provide security for study abroad students, and to allay fears about safety, one of the primary private concerns of students as they chose a study abroad destination. For example, SARU provides 24 hour emergency service (including free taxi rides to hospitals if necessary) for study abroad students, a service that is unavailable to local, domestic or full-fee paying international students. SARU thus attracts large numbers of American students studying abroad every semester, and has demonstrated considerable local agency in developing these programs. Using a gloconal perspective, it is evident that staff at SARU astutely interpreted the North American student need for a study abroad experience that fulfilled the broader mandate of "global competence" and has packaged "study abroad" within this consumerist paradigm (Bowen, 2001). Yet, as is also clear from the data, there are multiple unintended gloconal consequences of this local agency. The sheer number of American students in the Faculty of Humanities has saved it from downsizing or elimination, but has also fundamentally changed the intellectual character and content of that Faculty, raising questions about the uses of cultural knowledge and who ultimately benefits from the accumulated national heritage of South Africa.

There are additional, largely unexplored consequences of SARU's agency in creating a study abroad experience that respond to the contours of demands from students at universities such as BTRU. For example, housing for study abroad students is always of concern, as short (typically one semester) stays makes it difficult for many study abroad students to sign leases, and there are always the security and safety concerns typical of millennial students and parents (Howe and Strauss, 2007). In the case of SARU, there is not enough on-campus housing for incoming study abroad students, thus the office contracts with local families in the immediate campus vicinity for housing. This housing is inspected and monitored on a regular basis to ensure adequate levels of safety. Yet, this arrangement has unanticipated consequences for the local community and other (local and international) students seeking house. SARU's IAPO office contracts with families in the immediate vicinity (walking distance) of campus effectively makes this desirable housing unavailable to others, shrinks the pool of potential housing available to them, and simultaneously raises rents to levels keyed to what the U.S.---not South African--student can afford. SARU, as an institution, is not a powerless player here--the study abroad program (and its unintended effects) are of its own making. Its attempts to operate (and stay alive, vibrant, and thriving) within the new global playing field have had financial benefits for the institution, though uneven and at times troubling consequences for the local community, poor and working class South African students, the Faculty of Humanities, and other global actors at SARU, particularly African international students.

While gloconal analysis leads in different directions when examining the institutional practices of study abroad, there is considerably more convergence in the area of international students. In both local/national contexts, there is substantial xenophobia surrounding the presence of international students within what are publically perceived to be either local/state

(BTRU) or national (SARU) institutions. At BTRU, a small, proposed increase in the number of international undergraduates, buried deep within a strategic plan, created a racist uproar in the Chicago press. Rarely publically discussed--at least in-state---are the large number of international graduate students already present at BTRU, and the ways in which BTRU is structurally and economically dependent on these graduate students to further its research and teaching mission. A similar xenophobia exists at SARU. While historical racial inequality in South Africa might suggest that tensions would exist between predominantly white study abroad students from the United States and predominantly black local South African students, such analysis ignores that access to limited resources is at the core of such tensions and struggles. In the case of SARU, white study abroad students are positioned outside of the structures and enrollment limits: they do not compete directly with South African students for places in popular faculties that are linked directly to careers and the job market. Study abroad students have limited access to those faculties, and are instead concentrated in the Faculty of Humanities, which has sparse local enrollment. In contrast, while SADC community enrollments are capped, there is a perception that SARU is attempting to profit from enrolling full-fee paying African students from nations outside SADC, creating resentment among local students.

Finally, gloconal analysis allows for a discussion of the relationship between study abroad and international students *within* each local context. At BTRU, study abroad and international students are separated, both structurally, and within the larger discourses of internationalization. Study Abroad is heavily promoted and advocated on campus as the means to achieve global competence. The actual manifestations of decades of internationalization at BRTU---embodied in the physical presence of thousands of international students--are largely silenced, for fear of increased backlash from Illinois residents, alumni, and lawmakers in the

larger context of scarce resources in an era of increased global economic competition. At SARU, one office oversees both study abroad and international students (both SADC and full-fee paying), allowing for more direct conflict for scarce resources in that context. Thus, for example, as discussed previously there is resentment among SADC and full-fee paying (African international students) that services available for study abroad students are not available to them. All exist on the SARU campus as "international" students, but different categories are created (and treated differently) that reflect---not challenge--global economic and political inequalities As a result, the reality in which BTRU undergraduates (among others) are achieving their "global competence" is saturated with existing global dynamics. While SARU staff demonstrated considerable local agency in creating their study abroad program, and astutely accessing the North American quest for "global competency," they finds themselves locked into a larger set of global politics that they cannot escape, nor mitigate at the local level.

Internationalizing Higher Education: Towards a Analysis of Encounter

The practices that are constitutive of the internationalization of higher education-----including study abroad and international students--- cannot be fully-analyzed within a framework that sees only the private, individual, economic aspects of these practices. Instead, these practices must be understood as ones that are fully implicated in the public sphere, and have the potential to influence gloconal dynamics (author reference omitted). For example, the public xenophobia faced by international students at BTRU is not new. As Sevan Terzian and Leigh Ann Osborne (2006) discuss, many U.S. institutions limited or banned international students after World War II. South Africa's ambivalence about internationalization is also clear: a position that Jonathan Jansen, Carlton McLellan, and Ryan Greene (2007) term the "politics of ambivalence." As Martin Hall (2004), then Deputy Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cape

Town asserted in his address at the International Education Association of South Africa annual meeting, "…it is not automatically apparent that internationalization is beneficial to higher education…..the case for internationalization needs to be made, and cannot be assumed (p. 2)." Neither is this xenophobia or ambivalence unique to those locales, instead, as Marginson, Nyland, Sawir, and Forbes-Mewett (2010) chart in an important new book, xenophobia is rampant in nations, such as Australia, that have become major worldwide destinations for international students. While individual international students may suffer, survive, and go home to prosperous careers and secure futures (though it should be noted that a few have been murdered), focusing solely on individual outcomes ignores the larger questions about the responsibility of institutions in the face of such hatred. Similarly, an analysis that centers the achievement of global competence for individual BTRU students skirts around the gloconal dynamics in which that discourse rests: satisfying the public demands of a flagship within its local context, while BTRU students engage in protected study abroad experiences in other countries.

Theoretically, this research suggests that there is great need for increased research on internationalization that focuses on the microdynamics of the gloconal "encounters" that are created--intentionally or otherwise---through the promulgation of these practices. For example, this research focused on understanding and analyzing the institutional practices of study abroad and international students, and thus concentrated on interviewing faculty and staff at BTRU and SARU. While this research points towards extremely important gloconal dynamics, to fully understand these practices, the voices of study abroad and international students at both institutions needs to be included (though this is beyond the current scope of this article, my previous research includes such a focus on study abroad students). A focus on "encounter" as a

central trope of research on internationalizing higher education centers the dynamics of connection and disconnection, alongside convergence and divergence. As I have discussed in previous work on the writings of Jamaica Kincaid (Dolby, 2003), centering connection as a framework emphasizes the importance of understanding the coevalness (Korang, 1999) of humanity, and that, for example, the development of "global competence" among North American undergraduates must always be understood and analyzed through the outcomes-both positive and negative--not just for the individual student, but for communities worldwide. At the institutional level, it is critical to develop analysis that begins to examine these flows *relationally*--not simply comparatively. In other words, how do policies at BTRU influence what happens at SARU, and vice-versa? How are other campuses/communities with large numbers of study abroad students (for example) changed by those dynamics? How are communities that are service-learning sites affected? How might institutions create international learning communities--not simply institutions with large numbers of international students? Such questions begin to direct our attention to a different type of outcome than the individualistic ones that are so often pursued in research on study abroad and international students. Instead, our research questions should strive to examine the everyday practices and outcomes of internationalization through meaningful questions about the role of higher education and the public good, within local, national, and global contexts.

.

[1] Though of course they are not the only ones. For example, the 2008 American Council of Education report, *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses* considers four factors: institutional support; curriculum (including study abroad), programs, and co-curricular opportunities; and international students. This article recognizes the importance of all four factors, while concentrating on study abroad and international students.

[2] Curricular concerns are addressed peripherally, as they were discussed in some interviews, and are thus a component of the data that was analyzed. At both SARU and BTRU, study abroad intersects with the curriculum, though in markedly different ways.

[3] For historical perspective on the changing rationales for internationalizing higher education, see Sandra Meiras (2004). For broader overview of the entire research trajectory of internationalization and higher education, see Dolby and Rahman, 2008.

[4] PPP (purchasing power parity) is a method of calculating GDP that takes into account cost of living expenses in local contexts.

[5] Both the International Monetary Fund and the Central Intelligence Agency (USA) also produce ranked list of GDP/PPP, which vary slightly from World Bank estimates.

[6] The Human Development Index, developed in the early 1990s, was developed to shift the focus of comparative economic data from national economies to the reality of people's lives. The index calculates "very high," "high," "medium" and "low" human development nations based on life expectancy, education, and income (GDP/PPP). In 2010, the top ranked nation was Norway, and

#169 was Zimbabwe. With the exception of Afghanistan and Haiti, the lowest-ranked thirty nations in the world are all in Africa. The rankings exclude some nations (e.g., North Korea) who either refuse to release data, or for whom accurate data is not available.

[7] In July 2006, SARU formed the Internationalisation Management Advisory Group (IMAG). Under the leadership of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, External Relations. IMAG's members include IAPO's management team, the Deans of all of the Faculties, and representatives from multiple administrative offices and the university senate. This is the first formal body created at SARU for the purposes of advising and setting policy on internationalization.

[8] For example, in 2009, SARU enrolled 23,500 students, and employed approximately 4500 staff (44% academic, and 56% administrative in support). In contrast, BTRU enrolled almost 42,000, and employed 11,654 (26% faculty and 74% administrative professional and support staff (74%).

[9] The following individuals at SARU were interviewed:

1. Deputy Vice-Chancellor, External Relations
2. Director, Internationalisation
3. Director, USHEPIA Program (and former Director of the IAPO office)
4. Manager: African Academic Links
5. Manager: Finance and Administration
6. Manager: Internationalisation at Home
7. Manager: Full Degree Students
8. Manager, Mobility and Links
9. Coordinator: Mobility and Links

[10] The following individuals at BTRU were interviewed:

1. Associate Provost, International Affairs

2. Associate Dean, College of Communications

3. Assistant Dean, College of Engineering

4. Assistant Dean, College of Liberal Arts

5. Dean, College of Education

6. Director, Center for Global Studies (Title IV Center)

7. Academic Director, Global Crossroads Living/Learning Center

8. Head, Department of Landscape Architecture

9. Professor, College of Education

10. Associate Dean, Graduate College

11. Professor and Associate Dean, College of Medicine

12. Acting Director, Office of Study Abroad

13. Director, International Students Services

14. Director, Center for Global Studies

15. Head, Department of Landscape Architecture

16. Assistant Dean, College of Law

17. Director, European Union Center

[11] The Committee was originally named the "International Advisory Committee" and was referred to by that name in the charge letter (which is dated September 2008, after this research concluded). However, the committee is now referred to as the "International Council" and that is the name of the document posted on the BTRU website.

[12] The entire list is too lengthy to reproduce here. Links to websites are omitted to protect the identity of the institution.

[13] For the most comprehensive discussion of mergers and specific case studies, see Jonathan Jansen (2002). See also M.T. C. Sehoole (2005), Marcus Balintulo (2004), and Andrew Nash (2006).

[14] Southern African Development Community (SADC) agreements allow students from the region to study at universities throughout the region without paying additional international fees. Current protocols commit South African institutions to enroll at least 5% SADC students. See Michael Cross and Sepideh Rouhani (2004).

[15] Consolidation of teacher training colleges and faculties of education began several years earlier. On mergers, see Jansen (2002).

[16] As Soudien and Corneilse argue, the phrase "world-class African university" was used so frequently by the vice-chancellor in the late 1990s that it became "[university name omitted]'s new motto" (p. 308). On the use of "world-class" in Europe and Asia, see Deem, Mok, and Lucas (2008).

On early processes of desegregation at SARU, see Reitumetse Obakeng Mabokela (2000). See also Paula Ensor (2004) on issues of curriculum transformation, and Philip Taylor (2004) for a small case study which examines the perspectives of students in the School of Education at SARU in 1998. On large-scale changes in the landscape of South African higher education post-1994, see Jansen (2004) and Balintulo (2004).

[17] "Top 500 World Universities." Institute of Higher Education, Shanghai Jiao Tong University.

[18] The literature on the dynamics of race and class during and post-apartheid is extensive. See Molatlhegi Trevor Chika Sehoole (2005a) for an excellent history of educational inequality and policy in the context of higher education. My earlier book on racial identity in a Durban high school in 1996 (Dolby, 2001) also provides an historical overview. See also Peter Kallaway

(2002); Mokubung Nkomo (1990); Harold Wolpe (1988); and Elaine Unterhalter et al. (1991). Crain Soudien (2007) provides an overview of the research on school integration from the 1970s to the present.

[19] For example, the Office of the Dean of Men reports that 79 "citizens of other countries" were enrolled at BTRU in second semester 1943-44. Such statistics were kept during the war to track foreigners. The enrollment included 14 German students, and one from Japan. (Office of the Dean of Men, name of university office, 1944).

[20] At the time, the state system included BTRU, and two Chicago campuses. BTRU underwent a name change in 1982.

[21] Statistics for 1955/56 and 1968/69 are only available for all state campuses combined.

[22] More recently, ACE (2005, 2008) has produced reports measuring progress towards internationalization at research universities. Commenting on the 2008 report, Madeleine Green, a co-author of the survey, indicated, "Overall, internationalization doesn't permeate the fabric of most institutions." (American Council on Education, 2008).

[23] For expanded discussion, see also Geiger and Sá (2008) and Greenberg, 2007.

[24] In 2007, the Illinois state system included four three campuses: BTRU, Chicago, and Springfield. A fourth campus (Global Campus) opened in January 2008. and closed in May 2009 Separate budgetary figures for BTRU are reported if available.

[25] In addition to SARU, the partner universities are Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Makerere University, University of Botswana, University of Dar Es Salaam, University of Nairobi, University of Zambia, University of Zimbabwe. For more information, see http://web.uct.za/misc/iapo/ushepia.

[26] Interview with the first IAPO Director, March 2006.

[27] Interview with the first IAPO Director, March 2006. For discussion of Australia trip, "Report on Visit to Eight Australian Universities to Investigate Internationalization in Tertiary Education." July 1997, Director of IAPO.

[28] Interview with the first Office Manager (now Manager, Internationalism at Home), March 2006.

[29] Profit from SSA in 2006 was R 8.9 m, or approximately 1.37 million U.S. dollars, at the estimated exchange rate of 6.5 rand to the U.S. dollar.

[30] Interview with first IAPO Director, March 2006. See endnote #47 for a discussion of the issue of the financial incentives for recruiting international students in the Australian context.

[31] Interview with Manager, Mobility and Links Section, IAPO, March 2006.

[32] Interview with Manager, Mobility and Links Section, IAPO, March 2006.

[33] From 2000-2006, 75-80% of Semester Study Abroad students were enrolled in the Faculty of Humanities. This was a deliberate enrollment management policy: other Faculties either prohibited or strictly limited the enrollment of SSA students because of high demand from South African undergraduates.

[34] Interview with Deputy Vice-Chancellor, External Relations, March 2006.

[35] Interview with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, External Relations, March 2006.

[36] Interview with the Manager, Mobility and Links, March 2006.

[37] Before the mid/late 1980s, there was no centralized reporting mechanism for U.S. study abroad statistics. From its inception (1948) through 1973, *Open Doors* collected data on U.S. study abroad through a survey of foreign institutions in which they were asked to report the number of U.S. students on campus. This survey was discontinued in 1973 because of declining responses rates. In 1986/1987, *Open Doors* began to collect regular (though at first, not yearly)

statistics from U.S. institutions themselves on the number of students participating in study abroad for academic credit. In 1989, for example, 497 BTRU students studied abroad.

[38] Interview with Associate Dean, Graduate College. May 2007.

[39] Interview with Assistant Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, May 2007.

[40] Interview with Assistant Dean, College of Engineering, November 2007.

[41] Interview with Professor and Associate Dean, College of Medicine, May 2007.

[42] Interview with Assistant Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, May 2007.

[43] Numbers vary. Altbach et al. use the 2.5 million figure, while the OECD statistic for 2008 is 3.3 million.

[44] 20% of the total student enrollment at SARU in 2006 was international (including SSA). In comparison, in 2005, SARU's total international student enrollment was 22.4%. Only Rhodes University, with a 2005 total percentage of 26.5% international students had a higher percentage of international students, though it should be noted that Rhodes overall student population of 6324 students in 2005 is significantly smaller than SARU's 21,731 students in the same year. Rhodes enrolls very few (under 50) study abroad or exchange students, thus almost their entire international student population is full degree. Statistics on 2006 Rhodes enrollment were not available. For additional enrollment data, see Study South Africa (http://www.studysa.co.za).

[45] As of 2007, SADC member nations included: Angola, Botswana, The Democratic Republic of Congo, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Nambia, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

[46] Interview with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, External Relations, March 2006.

[47] Elsewhere in this essay I have used the term “black” as an inclusive term which encompasses individuals who identify as African, coloured, or Indian (consistent with the definition of “black”

in the Black Consciousness Movement). However, in common usage in South Africa, "black" refers only to individuals who identify as African. Thus, "black" in interview data should be understood in this way.

[48] Interview with Deputy Vice-Chancellor, External Relations, March 2006.

[49] Interview with Deputy Vice-Chancellor, External Relations, March 2006. This case study was condSARUed in March 2006. In May 2008, anti-immigrant attacks throughout South Africa were the focus of worldwide attention (see Chilwane, 2008; UN Integrated Regional Information Networks, 2008).

[50] Interview with Deputy Vice-Chancellor, External Relations, March 2006.

[51] Pattman also argues that race is of continuing significance in how students understand identities, though in a constructed and relational sense. See Pattman (2007) for discussion. Melanie Walker (2005), in her study of undergraduates at another South African university, argues that race is simultaneously nowhere and everywhere.

[52] Report on Visit to Eight Australian Universities to Investigate Internationalization in Tertiary Education", p. 6. July 1997

[53] Interview with Director, Internationalisation, March 2006.

[54] Interview with Director, Internationalisation, March 2006.

[55] Interview with Manager, Mobility and Links Section, March 2006.

[56] Certainly issues surrounding international students (both study abroad and full-degree) are of significant concerns in other nations. Perhaps most notably, Australia has become a leading destination world-wide for full degree international students, though lately there are concerns about Australia's growing dependence on international student tuition revenues. Comparative issues are not explored in this essay, though as noted data analysis on a U.S. site is completed,

and research in Australia is pending. See Marginson and Considine (2000), Meiras (2004) and Slattery (2008) on the economics of international education in Australia.

[57] The Strategic Plan also indicated an increase in transfer students from 1200 to 1700. The plan also included $250,000 for recruitment from community colleges, and scholarships, indicating that the assumption was that the 500 additional transfer students per year would have been predominantly from Illinois community colleges. Such nuance was completely lost in the public discourse.

[58] Goudie refers here to the controversy at BTRU over the use of Chief Illiniwek as the school mascot. The mascot was finally retired in 2007 after two decades of protest.

[59] In 2009, a *Chicago Tribune* investigation revealed that BTRU had a second, "shadow" admissions policy through which connected but unqualified students were admitted to BTRU. Eppley's "suggestion" can certainly be read in multiple ways, now knowing that additional context. President Joseph White and six of nine trustees resigned later that year.

[60] Interview with Associate Dean, Graduate College. May 2007.

[61] Interview with Associate Dean, Graduate College, May 2007.

[62] Open Doors statistics are reported on an academic year, and BTRU statistics are reported using the calendar year. Thus there is a slight variation in reported numbers and percentages.

[63] Interview with Associate Dean, College of Communications, November 2007.

References

Agarwal, P., Said, M.E., Sehoole, M.C., Sirazi, M. and H. de Wit (2007). The dynamics of international student circulation in a global context. In P. Altbach and P.M. Peterson (Eds.), *Higher Education in the New Century: Global challenges and innovative ideas* (pp. 109-144). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Alexander, K. and D. Layzell (2006). Changing priorities and the evolution of public higher education in Illinois. " In R. Ehrenberg, *What's Happening to Public Higher Education?* Madison, WI: Onyx Press.

Altbach, P.and P.M. Peterson (2007). (Eds.)*Higher Education in the New Century: Global challenges and innovative ideas*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Altbach, P, Reisberg, L., and L. Rumbley (2009). *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an academic revolution.* A report prepared for the UENSCO 2009 World Conference on Higher education. Paris: UNESCO.

American Council on Education (1956). *The Responsibility of Higher Education for Helping to Develop International Understanding*. Washington, D.C. :author.

American Council on Education (2008, May 22). Colleges and universities make uneven progress in internationalizing their campuses, ACE analysis finds. Washington, DC: author. Retrieved at http://www.acenet.edu on June 23, 2008.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Arnove, R. and C. Torres (2003). *Comparative Education: The dialectic of the global and the local* (2nd edition). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Backman, E. (1984). *Approaches to International Education*. New York: American Council on Education.

Balintulo, M. (2004). The role of the state in the transformation of South African higher education,1994-2002: Equity and redress revisited. In P. T. Zeleza and A. Olukoshi (Eds.) *African universities in the twenty-first century, Volume II, knowledge and society* (pp. 441-458) Dakar: Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa.

Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education 45*, 43-70

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the Marketplace: The commercialization of higher education.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bowen, M. (2001). Consumerism and U.S. study abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education 5*(3), 182-200.

Bousquet, M. (2008). *How the University Works: Higher education and the low-wagenation*. New York: New York University Press.

Brustein, W. (2007).The global campus: Challenges and opportunities for higher education in North America. *Journal of Studies in International Education 11*(3/4), 382-391.

Chilwane, L. (2008). Xenophobic terror leaves trail of misery. *Business Day* (South Africa). May 20, p. 4.

Chisholm, L. (ed.) (2004). *Changing class: Education and social change in post-apartheid South Africa.* London: Zed Books.

Coffman, J. and K. Brennan (2003). African studies abroad: Meaning and impact of America's burgeoning export industry. *Frontiers: The Journal of Study Abroad IX*(Fall), 139-147.

Colete, N. (Ed.) (2002). *Transformation in higher education: Local realities in South Africa*. Cape Town: Juta and Co.

Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program (2005). *Global competence and national needs: One million Americans studying abroad*. Washington, D.C.: author.

Council on Higher Education (2009). *Higher Education Monitor: The state of higher education in South Africa.* October. Cape Town: author.

Compton, R. (2007). *Two Million Minutes* (DVD). author.

Cross, M. and S. Rouhani (2004). Vanishing borders and new boundaries: Student and staff mobility and the internationalisation of South African higher education. In P. T. Zeleza and A. Olukoshi (Eds.), *African universities in the twenty-first century, Volume II, knowledge and society* (pp. 234-249). Dakar: Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa.

Department of Education, Employment, and Workforce Relations (2008) *Outbound Mobility Practices at Australian Universities: Key findings of the 2008 institutional survey of outbound mobility practices at Australian universities.* www.studyoverses.gov.au

Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities: Is the local dimension still important? *Comparative Education 37*(1), 7-20

Deem, R. Mok, K.H.., and Lucas, L. (2008). Transforming higher education in whose image? Exploring the concept of the 'world-class' university in Europe and Asia. *Higher Education Policy 21*, 83-97.

deWit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Division of Management Information, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign(2009). UIUC Student Enrollment. Urbana, IL. Retrieved at http://www.dmi.illinois/edu/stuenr on October 6, 2009.

Dolby, N. (2001). *Constructing Race: Youth, Identity, and Popular Culture in South Africa.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Dolby, N. (2003) *A Small Place*: Jamaica Kincaid and a Methodology of Connection. *Qualitative Inquiry 9* (1): 57-73.

Dolby, N. (2004). Encountering an American Self: Study Abroad and National Identity. *Comparative Education Review 48*(2): 150-173.

Dolby, N. and A. Rahman (2008). Research in international education. *Review of Educational Research 78*(3), 676-726.

Dunn, M. and P. Nilan (2007). Balancing economic and other discourses in the internationalization of higher education in South Africa. *Review of Education 53*, 265 281.

Edwards, J. (2007). Challenges and opportunities for the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade: Planned and opportunistic initiatives in American institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education 11*(3-4), 373 381.

Ellingboe, B. (1998). Divisional strategies to internationalise a campus portrait: Results, resistance and recommendations from a case study at U.S. universities. In *Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus,* eds. J.A. Mestenhauser and B. J. Ellingboe (pp.198-228). Phoenix: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

Ensor, P. (2004). Contesting discourses in higher education curriculum restructuring in South Africa. *Higher Education 48,* 339-359.

European Commission (2010). History of the Erasmus Programme. Retrieved on November 24 at http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus/doc1709_en.htm

Friedman, S. (2005). Getting better than "world class": The challenge of governing postapartheid South Africa. *Social Research 72*(3), 757-794.

Gaffikin, F. and Perry, D. (2009). Discourses and strategic visions: The U.S. research university as an institutional manifestation of neoliberalism in a global era. *American Educational Research Journal 46* (March), 115-144.

Geiger, R. (2004). *Knowledge and Money: Research universities and the paradox of the marketplace.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Geiger, R. and C. Sá (2008). *Tapping the Riches of Science: Universities and the promise of economic growth.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Giroux, H. (2007). *The university in chains: Confronting the military-industrial-academic complex.* Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Goudie, C. (2006, March 27). Why we need to fight the University of Illinois' foreign policy. *Daily Herald*, p. 15.

Goudie, C. (2006, April 3). U of I concocts 'talking points' to answer fighting mad Illini. *Daily Herald*, p. 17.

Green, M., Luu, D. and B. Burris (2008). *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. campuses: 2008 edition*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Greenberg, D. (2007). *Science for Sale*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hall, M. (2004). The importance of internationalization for higher education. Paper presented at the International Education Association of South Africa Annual Meeting. September.

Henry, M., Lingard, B., Rizvi, F. and S Taylor (1999). Working with/against globalization in education. *Journal of Education Policy 14*(1), 85-97.

Herren, R. (2002). Whence we came: The land-grant tradition-origin, evolution, and implications for the 21st century. *Journal of Agricultural Education 43*(4), 88-98.

Hines, E., G.A. Hickrod, and G. Pruyne (1989). *State Support of Higher Education: From expansion to steady state to decline, 1969 to 1989, including an Illinois case study*. Bloomington, IL: Center for Higher Education, Illinois State University.

Howe, N. and W. Strauss (2007). *Millennials Go to College*. Great Falls, VA: Lifecourse Associates.

Huang, F. (2006). Internationalization of curricula in higher education institutions in comparative perspectives: Case studies of China, Japan, and the Netherlands. *Higher Education 51*, 521-539.

Human Development Index (2010). *Human Development Reports*. Retrieved at http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/hdi/

Hunter, B., White, G. and G. Godbey (2006). What does it mean to be globally competent? *Journal of Studies in International Education 10*, 267-285.

Ikenberry, S. and T. Hartle (2000). *Where We Have Been and Where We Are Going*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Ikenberry, S. Layzell, D. and W.R. Kangas (2008). Higher education and Illinois' future. Urbana, IL: Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign.

Institute of International Education (2005). *Open doors, 1948-2004, Report on International Educational Exchange*. New York: author (CD-ROM). Washington, D.C.: author.

Institute of International Education (2008). *Open Doors 2008*. New York: author.

Institute of International Education (2010). *Open Doors 2010*. New York: author.

International Student and Scholar Services, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (2007). International Student Enrollment Statistics.

Jansen, J. (2002). *Mergers in higher education: Lessons learned in transitional contex*ts Pretoria: Unisa Press, 2002.

Jansen, J. (2004). Changes and continuities in South Africa's higher education system, 1994 2002. In L.Chisholm (Ed.), *Changing class: Education and social change in Post apartheid South Africa* (pp.293-314). London: Zed Books.

Jansen, J. (2006). Accounting for autonomy. In R. Pithouse (Ed.), *Asinamali: University struggles in post-apartheid South Africa* (pp. 11-21). Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Jansen, J., McLellan, C., and R. Greene (2007). Internationalization in South African universities: On the politics of ambivalence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society. Baltimore, MD. February.

Kallaway, P. (2002). (ed.) *The history of education under apartheid, 1948-1994*. New York Peter Lang.

Kelderman, E. (2009, May 1). Public colleges consider privatization as a cure for the common recession. *The Chronicle of Higher Education 55*(34), p. A 16

Kirp, S. (2003). *Shakespeare, Einstein, and the Bottom Line: The marketing of higher education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kishun, R. (2007). The Internationalisation of higher education in South Africa: Progress and challenges. *Journal of Studies in International Education 11*(3/4), 455-469.

Knight, J. and H. de Wit (1997). *Internationalisation of higher education in Asian Pacific countries*. Amsterdam: EAIE.

Korang, K. (1999, September 13). Locating the West's Other in a coeval anthropology: Or, how to read the postcolonial African literary subject/object. Paper presented at the Unit for

Criticism and Interpretive Theory Colloquium Series. University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign.

Kraak, A. (2000). *Changing modes: New knowledge production and its implications for higher education in South Africa*. Pretoria: Human Science Research Council.

Labi, A. (2010). As Europe's higher education system tries to work in concert, notes of discord remain. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved at chronicle.com on December 1, 2010.

Lewin, R. (2009). *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher education and thequest for global citizenship*. New York: Routledge.

Lutabingwa, J.L. (2005). Internationalisation at South African universities: The role of a central international office. *South African Journal of Higher Education 19*(6), 1108-1119

Ma, W. (2008). The University of California at Berkeley: An emerging global research university. *Higher Education Policy 21*, 65-81.

Mabokela, R. O. (2000). *Voices of conflict: Desegregating South African universities*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer

Mabokela, R.O. and K.L. King (2001). *Apartheid no more: Case studies of Southern African universities in the process of transformation*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.

Marginson, S. (2007). University mission and identity for a post post-public era. *Higher Education Research and Development 26*(1), 117-131

Marginson, S. (2009). Open source knowledge and university rankings. *Thesis Eleven 96*, 9-39.

Marginson, S. and M. Considine (2000). *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press

Marginson, S. and G. Rhaodes (2002 Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic, *Higher Education*, 43 (3), pp. 281-309.

Marginson, S. and E. Sawir (2005). Interrogating global flows in higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education 3*(3), 281-309.

Marginson, S. and E. Sawir (2006). University leaders' strategies in the global environment: A comparative study of Universitas Indonesia and the Australian National University. *Higher Education 52*, 343-373.

Marginson, S. and E. Sawir (in press). Student security in the global education market. *Social Policy Review 23*.

Marginson, S., Nyland, C., Sawir, E. and H. Forbes-Mewett (2010). *International Student Security*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

McLellan, C. (2008). Speaking of internationalization: An analysis of policy discourses on internationalization of higher education in post-apartheid South Africa. *Journal of Studies in International Education 12*(2), 131-147.

McLellan, C. (2009). Cooperative policies and African international students: Do policy spirits match experiences? *Higher Education Policy 22*, 282-302.

Meiras, S. (2004). International education in Australian universities: Understandings, dimensions, and problems. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management 26*, 371-380.

Mohrman, K., Ma, W. and D. Baker (2008). The research university in transition: The emerging global model. *Higher Education Policy 21*, 5-27.

Mtembu, T. (2004). Creating a niche in internationalization for (South) African higher education institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education 8*(3), 282-296.

Nash, A. (2006). Restructuring South African universities. In R. Pithouse (Ed.) *Asinamali: university struggles in post-apartheid South Africa* (pp 1-10) Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Nelson, C. (2003). Consolations for capitalists: Propositions in flight from World Bank literature. In A. Kumar (Ed.), *World Bank literature* (pp. 3-11). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Nelson, C. (1997). *Manifesto of a Tenured Radical*. New York: New York University Press.

Newfield, C. (2008). *Unmaking the Public University: The forty-year assault on the middle class*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nkomo, M. (1990). *Pedagogy of domination: Toward a democratic education in South Africa.* Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press.

Nthsoe, I. (2004). The politics and economics of postapartheid higher education transformation. *Comparative Education Review 48*(2), 202-221.

Oakman, D. (2004). *Facing Asia: A history of the Colombo Plan*. Canberra: Pandanus Books.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 2010. *Highlights from Education at a Glance 2010.* Retrieved on November 24, 2010 at http://www.oecd ilibrary.org/.

Office of the Dean of Men, University of Illinois (1944). Facts about students registered in second semester 1943-1944 who were born outside continental United States. University of Illinois Archives, International Student Publications 1943-1946. Record Series 41/5/801.

Office of the Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (2008, September 11). International Council Charge Letter. Champaign, IL: author.

Office of the Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign. (nd). 2007-2008 Mid-Year report on campus initiatives. Study abroad issues and enhancements. Retrieved at provost.illinois.edu on September 22, 2009.

Olukoshi, A. and P.T. Zeleza. (2004). Introduction: The struggle for African universities and knowledge. In P. T. Zeleza and A. Olukoshi (Eds.) *African universities in the twenty first century, Volume 1, liberalisation and internationalisation* (pp. 1-18). Dakar: Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa

O'Meara, P., Mehlinger, H. and R. M. Newman (Eds.) (2001). *Changing Perspectives on International Educatio*n. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Paige, M. (2003). The American case: The University of Minnesota. *Journal of Studies in International Education 7* (1), 52-63.

Pan, S. (2006). Economic globalization, politico-cultural identity and university autonomy: The struggle of Tsinghua University in China. *Journal of Education Policy 21*(3), 245 266.

Pattman, R. (2007). Student identities, and researching these, in a newly 'racially' merged university in South Africa. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education 10*(4), 473-492.

Rossi, R. (2006, May 16). U. of I. drops out-of-state campaign: 'Real, strong, negative reaction' led leaders to change course. *Chicago Sun-Times*, p. 8.

Ruther, J. (2002). *Barely There, Powerfully Present: Thirty years of U.S. policy on international higher education*. New York: Routledge.

Rouhani, S. (2007). Internationalisation of South African Higher Education in the Postapartheid Era. *Journal of Studies in International Education 11*(3/4), 470-485.

Rouhani, S. and R. Kishun (2004). Introduction: Internationalisation of higher education in (South) Africa. *Journal of Studies in International Education 8*(3), 235-243.

Sehoole, C.T. (2004). Trade in educational services: Reflections on the African and South African Higher Education System. *Journal of Studies in International Education 8(*3), 297-316.

Sehoole, M.T.C. (2005). *Democratizing higher education policy: Constraints of reform in post apartheid South Africa*. New York: Routledge.

Singh, M. (2010). Re-orienting internationalisation in African higher education. *Globalisation, Societies, and Education 8*(2), 269-282.

Slattery, L. (2008). Australian universities fear a dangerous dependence. *The Chronicle of Higher Education 54*(48). Retrieved at http://chronicle.com/weekly on September 11, 2008.

Slaughter, S. and G. Rhoades (2004).*Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Soudien, C. (2007). The asymmetries of contact: An assessment of 30 years of school integration in South Africa. *Race Ethnicity and Education 10*(4), 439-456.

Soudien, C. and C. Corneilse (2000). South African higher education in transition: Global discourses and national priorities. In N. Stromquist and K. Monkman, *Globalization and*

education: Integration and contestation across cultures (pp. 299-314). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Stake, R. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stearns, P. (2009). *Educating Global Citizens in Colleges and Universities*. New York: Routledge.

Streak, J. (2004). The Gear legacy: did Gear fail or move South Africa forward in development. *Development Southern Africa 21*(2), 271-288.

Stromquist, N. (2002). *Education in a globalized world*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Stromquist, N. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education 53*, 81-105.

Tabulawa, R. (2007). Global influences and local responses: The restructuring of the University of Botswana, 1990-2000. *Higher Education 53*, 457-482.

Taylor, J. (2004). Towards a strategy for internationalisation: Lessons and practices from four universities. *Journal of Studies in International Education 8*(2), 149-171.

Taylor, P. (2004). Fruits of democratic transformation of education in a South African university in 1998: Perspectives of students in the School of Education, University of Cape Town. *McGill Journal of Education 39*(3), 283-303.

Terzian, S. and L.A. Osborne (2006). Postwar era precedents and the ambivalent quest for international students at the University of Florida. *Journal of Studies in International Education 10*, 286-306.

Tierney, W. (2006). Introduction: The examined university: Process and change in higher education. In W. Tierney (Ed.), *Governance and the Public Good*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

UN Integrated Regional Information Networks (2008). South Africa: Dozens dead in anti-immigrant attacks. 19 May.

University of Illinois at Urbana (1969). The future: International Programs at the University of Illinois, Urbana. Urbana, IL: author. University of Illinois Archives Record Services 24/2/802, Box 1.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (2006). 2006 Performance Report. Urbana,IL: Author.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (2006a). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Strategic Plan, January 2006. Urbana, IL: author.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (2007). Campus Strategic Plan. Urbana, IL: Author.

Unterhalter, E., Wolpe, H., Botha, T., Badat, S., Dlamini, T. and B. Khotseng (1991). *Apartheid education and popular struggles*. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.

Varvus, F. and X Bartley (2006). Comparatively knowing: Making a case for the vertical case study. *Current Issues in Comparative Education 8*(2), 95-103.

Walker, M. (2005). Race is nowhere and race is everywhere: Narratives from black and white South African university students in post-apartheid South Africa. *British Journal of Sociology of Education 26*(1), 41-54.

Welch, A., Yang, R. and C. Wolhuter (2004). Internationalising a rural, historically black South African university. *Journal of Studies in International Education 8*(3), 317-331.

Whitney, K. (2006). Lost in translation: Governing in a time of privatization. In W. Tierney (Ed.), *Governance and the Public Good*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wolpe, H. (1988). *Race, class and the apartheid state*. Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press.

World Bank (2009). Data Catalog. Retrieved at *http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog*.

Zeleza, P. (2005). Transnational education and African universities. Keynote address. 11th General Conference of the Association of African Universities. February 21-25. Cape Town.